MISCELLANIES

LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS

CHR. WORDSWORTH

BISHOP OF LINCOLN

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



THE
WORDSWORTH COLLECTION
FOUNDED BY
CYNTHIA MORGAN ST. JOHN

THE GIFT OF
VICTOR EMANUEL
OF THE CLASS OF 1919

Wordsworth
BX
5037



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924103708115

MISCELLANIES.

VOL. III.

RIVINGTONS

London . . . . . *Waterloo Place*
Oxford . . . . . *Magdalen Street*
Cambridge . . . . . *Trinity Street*

MISCELLANIES

LITERARY AND RELIGIOUS

BY

CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D.

BISHOP OF LINCOLN

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. III.

RIVINGTONS

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

MDCCCLXXIX.

413

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Wor
PR5885
ami3
A750803

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

RELIGION IN SCIENCE.

	PAGE
Address at Colsterworth, Lincolnshire, Sir Isaac Newton's birthplace	1
Two Books of Almighty God—Nature and Scripture—Plan of the Nineteenth Psalm	1, 2
Sir Isaac Newton	2
Probability of Analogies between Nature and Grace	3
Bp. Butler—Ecclesiasticus—Origen	3
The Ptolemaic and Copernican Systems; Newton's work	3, 4
Probability that, if the Newtonian System is true, it will be found to be in harmony with the divine doings in the World of Grace.	3—5
Illustrations of this proposition, considered with reference to truths revealed in Scripture	5, 6
The Sun and the Planetary System; Christ and the World of Grace	6
Physical Laws of motion; Divine Grace and Human Free will	6, 7
Other relations of Planets to the Sun	7
Gravitation and Grace	8, 9
Answer to objections	8
"Laws of Nature"	9, 10
Planets and Fixed Stars	10, 11
Newton's life and example	11, 12
Conclusion	12, 13

RELIGIOUS USES OF CLASSICAL STUDIES.

Preface to Theocritus	14, 15
Pious heathens and modern Sceptics	16, 17
Union of secular and sacred studies	18, 19
Illustration of the religious uses of classical studies, from the works of HORACE	19—28
Popular estimate of the character of Horace—how far accurate	19, 20
Alexander Knox and Dr. Bentley	20
Providential dispensation in the long continued reign of Augustus	20
His plans of National Reformation, aided by Mæcenas, Agrippa, Horace, and Virgil	20, 21

PAGE

Poetical and Political Mission of Horace 21
How exemplified in the assertion of the Divine Supremacy over Governments 21
And in the assertion of the need of Divine help and protection . 21, 22
And of Public Worship—restoration of Temples . . . 21, 22
Patriotism 22
Simplicity of manners 22, 23
Protests against Covetousness and prodigality 23, 24
Maintenance of purity of Marriage 23
Augustan Legislation upon Marriage 23, 24
Failure of the Imperial attempts to reform Society, and to save the Empire from corruption and dissolution . . . . 23—26
Horace's two noble principles of action and composition; filial love; and dependence on a higher power 24, 25
What, if Horace had been a Christian? 25
Augustus (aided by all earthly appliances) failed. Christianity has succeeded, in social and domestic reformation; the reason why 25, 26
Consequent warning to England, and to other Nations . . 26, 27
With regard to Legislative enactments, and also as to systems of National Education 27, 28
May not European Nations (if they apostatize from Christianity) become as bad as heathen Rome? 27, 28
"Ethica et Spiritualia," for the use of Students of the Theological School, Lincoln . . . . . 29—52
Address to them 29, 30
English Translation of the Moral and Spiritual Maxims . 53—73
On the Spread of Infidelity, and on the need of a learned Clergy 74
The Bishop of Orleans, his description of French popular Literature . 74
What can the French Church do to counteract its influence? . . 75
Its position and tendencies 75
Ultramontanism drives men to Unbelief 75
Hopes of Christendom from the Anglican Churches . . . 75, 78
Consequent duties of the Anglican Episcopate and Priesthood; Need of a learned Clergy 75, 76
Paper read at the Lambeth Conference, September, 1878 . . 76—80
Condition of the Priesthood in the East—in Italy (recent unhappy measures in that country)—in France 76, 77
In Protestant Germany 77
Critical position of the Anglican Church 78
What is to be done? 79
Appeal to the past 79
Result of controversies 79
The Latter Days 80
Reference to the Abbé Bougaud's recent work, "Le Grand Péril de l'Église de France" 80, 81

PAGE
Reasons of his alarm 81, 82
To what is the danger really due? 81
M. Eugène Reveillaud; "La Question Religieuse" . . . 80, 81
His avowals and suggestions 81
Essays in the "Courrier de Lyon"—their confessions . . . 81
Practical inferences from these writings in relation to the Church of England 81, 82
On the DESTINY of MOHAMMEDANISM, especially in the TURKISH Dominions 85
Arguments on behalf of the application of the Ninth Chapter of the Book of Revelation to this subject; and authorities for it . . 85
Explanation of the prophecy in detail, and evidence of its fulfilment 83—89
Character of Mohammedan Rule 90
Titles of Sultan 93
Janissaries 95
"*Passing away*" of Mohammedanism 96, 97
Practical inferences and anticipations from this prophecy 97—99
Acquisition of Cyprus by England 99
The DECLINE of MOHAMMEDANISM a SIGNAL for a greater SPREAD of the GOSPEL; which will be to some a WOE 100
Meaning of the Seven successive Trumpets in the Book of Revelation 100, 101
The last Three Trumpets are called Trumpets of Woe . . . 101
On the Sixth Trumpet, or second Trumpet of Woe 101
Its meaning . . . . . 101—116
The Sixth Angel is an Angel of God; he is commanded by a divine Voice to loose the four Angels, who are Angels of God . 101, 102
The *four Angels* are to be loosed, who have *been bound* at the *river Euphrates*. What is the meaning of this? . . . 102—105
How it is now being fulfilled . . . . . 105—111
The propriety of the terrible imagery of the Vision . . . 106—110
How the Word of God may become a *Woe* . . . . 108—110
Present circulation of copies of the Bible 108
Why compared to an Army . . . . . 108—110
God's gifts to men are as they are used; either for weal or woe . 110—112
The solemn warning of this Prophecy; present need of it . . 112, 113
Practical application of it to the present moral, social, and religious condition of Christendom; and specially of England as a State and a Church . . . . . 112—116
Conclusion 115, 116
BISHOP SANDERSON; ON HUMAN CONSCIENCE AND LAW . . 116
His life; his Lectures at Oxford 116, 121
Value of his "Lectures on Conscience" Dr. Whewell; Bishop Barlow 118, 119
Sanderson's acts and profession of faith 120, 121
Reasons for publishing an English translation of these Lectures 121, 122
Bishop Jacobson's character of Bishop Sanderson 123

PAGE

On Ecclesiastical Legislation 124
Observations on the "Public Worship Regulation Bill" . . 124—132
Rights of Convocation . . . . . 126—130
Its relation to Parliament . . . . . 128—134
Dr. Johnson on Convocation 130
Withdrawal of Amendments 131
How we may gratify Romanists, and promote Romanism . . 127, 134
Precedents as to mode of Parliamentary Legislation on Ecclesiastical matters—"Act of Uniformity," "Comprehension Bill," "Act of Uniformity Amendment Act" 132, 133, 145
"Senates and Synods" 134
What action on the part of the Church was requisite as co-ordinate with such a Statute as the "Public Worship Regulation Bill" . 135
Wisdom of "Toleration by Law"—in certain ritual matters . 136—138
Position of Celebrant . . . . . 136—138
Use of a distinctive Eucharistic vestment; the Cope . . 138, 139
Discretionary Power of the Bishops under the "Public Worship Regulation Act" . . . . . 139, *note*
What is to be done? . . . . . 139—141
Appeal to Reformers and Revisers 140, 141

Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction 142
On the authority of the present Court of Arches; and of the Crown, advised by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council . . 142
Ought this authority to be resisted, on the plea of Zeal for the honour of our Lord and His Church . . . . . 142—149
Fundamental principles to be borne in mind . . . . 140—144
The "Laws of England" are the "King's Laws;" the Courts of England are "the King's Courts" 143, 144
Whence do Bishops derive their authority 144, 150
Are the sentences of the Court of Arches, and of the Judicial Committee, "spiritually null and void?" . . . 145—147, 149
Duty of Bishops and Clergy 147
Examples of our Lord and of the Apostles 149
What is to be done? 149, 150
Appeal to Bishop Sanderson; to Richard Hooker; to Bishop Andrewes; to Bishop Stillingfleet; to King Charles I.; to Chief Justice Coke; Lord Chancellor Clarendon; Sir Roger Twysden . . . . . 150—154

On Diocesan Synods and Diocesan Conferences . . . 155
Authorities on Diocesan Synods . . . . . 155—160
On the right constitution of "Diocesan Synods;" Archbishop Wake 156, 157, 159, 160
Diocesan Synods differ from Diocesan Conferences; in what respect? . . . . . 160—164
Proceedings of a Diocesan Synod 163, 164
Practical results at Lincoln 165

PAGE

ON THE SALE OF CHURCH PATRONAGE, AND ON SIMONY . 160—190
Church Patronage in Scotland 167
History of—and Warnings from: allegations of Nonconformists . 168
The *Ecclesiastical Gazette;* Simoniacal Advertisements. 168, 169, 185
The Church condemns Simony . . . . . 171—175
Unwise alteration of the 40th Canon 172
Books on Simony . . . . . 173, *note*
What is *Simony?* 173
Fallacies as to it . . . . . 173—175
Laws of the Church of England as to Simony; and opinions of the English Reformers thereon . . . . . 176—178
What is to be done? 178
By Legislation . . . . . 178—180
As to bonds of Resignation 181
And Donatives 181
By Individuals 181
By Patrons . . . . . 181—186
What the words *Advowson* and *Patron* really mean . . 182, 183
By Lawyers 184
By Newspapers 185
By Bishops and Clergy . . . . . 185—190
Act of Institution 186
Appeal to the Clergy . . . . . 187—190
Prayer 190

ON CLERICAL NON-RESIDENCE 191
Occasion of this Appeal 191
The words of our Blessed Lord 192
Questions proposed for consideration—The future reckoning . 192, 193
A "*non-resident Incumbent*" a contradiction in terms . . . 193
Ordination Service 193
Words of Ezekiel to such as do not feed their flock 194
St. Paul's language 194, 195
Bishop Burnet's comment upon it 195, 196
Bodily incapacity does not justify non-residence . . 197, 198
Bishop Gibson's words . . . . . 198, *note*
Laws on non-residence 198, 200
The "Incumbents Resignation Act" 201
Conclusion 201

ON MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE 202
Occasion of this discourse 201
Debates on the Divorce Bill 202, 203
Reflexions on the "Declaration" upon it (A.D. 1857) . . . 203
Institution and History of Marriage in Scripture . . . 203, 204
Legal practice with regard to, in England 205
Creation of a "Divorce Court" 205
Gravity of questions involved 206

PAGE

Our Lord's declarations on the subject, in the Gospel of St. Matthew . . . . . 207—211
In the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke 211
Theory of the Church of Rome . . . . . 210—212
Her inconsistent practice 212, 222
Inferences to be derived from our Lord's statements in St. Matthew's Gospel, as compared with His declarations in St. Mark and St. Luke . . . . . 212—216
Patristic testimonies on the subject—S. Augustine, Tertullian, Lactantius, in the Western Church 217
Council of Arles 217
S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, S. Epiphanius, Theodoret, Euthymius Zygabenus in the East 217, 218
Thomassinus, Launoy, Bingham 218
Anglican Divines—Bishop Hall, Dr. Hammond, Herbert Thorndike, Bishop Taylor, Bishop Cosin, Bishop Horsley . . . 218—221
Consequences of contending for the unqualified indissolubility of Marriage 222
On Marriage with a divorced person 223
Our Lord's words—their real meaning 223, 224
What might have been St. Augustine's opinion on them, if he had argued from the original Greek, or had possessed an adequate translation of them in Latin . . . . . 223, *note*
Grounds of our Lord's prohibition 225
S. Augustine's Mother—Example of 226
What is the cause of Adultery? . . . . . 225—228
How Adultery was treated under the Levitical Law 225
And by our Reformers 229
What is the true remedy for guilt? 229
Law and practice of Rome—results of 229
Law and practice of Germany (Baron von Gerlach) results of . 230
Law and practice of England 231
Good results of indissolubility of Marriage, except for Adultery 231, 232
What will be the results of a Divorce Court? 233
Appeal to the Legislature 233, 234
Appeal on behalf of the Church and the Clergy 234
Reference to Archbishop Laud—his prayer 234, 235
Gravity of the Crisis (1857); England's duty 235, 236

On Marriage with a Deceased *Wife's Sister* 237
True character of the Code of Leviticus, chap. xviii. . . . 237—241
"Table of prohibited Degrees," authority of 238
The extermination of the Canaanites, a warning to England . 238—240
The meaning of the Bible how to be ascertained; Our Lord's practice . . . . . 240—242
Your wife's sister is your sister 241
Proof that a man may not marry his wife's sister . . . 241—243

PAGE
Bishop Jewel 243
Allegations against this statement examined . . . . 244—246
The meaning of Leviticus xviii. 18 . . . . . 246—248
Authority of the Rabbis considered 250
Testimony of the Church against the Marriage of a deceased wife's sister 250
Law and Practice of the Church of Rome 251
Case of those who have contracted these Marriages . . . 252, 253
Testimony of Reformers 252
The Social aspect of the question 253
Consequences of the repeal of the Law which prohibits these Marriages 254
Reference to the position of the Clergy, as it would be affected by the repeal of the Law 255
Conclusion 255, 256

On Enforced Clerical Celibacy 257
Letter upon it to the Cologne Congress—occasion of . . . 258
Testimony of Scripture 258, 259
Practice of ancient Church 259, 260
Translation of the Letter . . . . . 261—265
Decision of the "Old Catholics" 266

On Sisterhoods and Vows 267
Letter to Sir George Prevost—occasion of 268
Value of English Sisterhoods 268
Appeal to Holy Scripture 268, 269
St. Paul's command concerning Vows of Celibacy for Women . 269, 287
Testimonies of the Primitive Church 270, 271
Doctrine of S. Ambrose, S. Basil, S. Jerome, S. Augustine; and decrees of Councils concerning Virgins . . . . . 271—274
Results of the system 275
On the terms "*Sister*," and "*Sisterhood*" 275
Contrast between the practice of some English Sisters and that of the Virgins of the ancient Church . . . . . 275—277
"*Sisters of Charity*"—S. Vincent de Paul—his wise rule . 278—280
On Vows of Obedience and Poverty 280
Practical suggestions as to English Sisterhoods . . . 280—282
On the relaxation of Vows . . . . . 282—286
Notice of the *Rev. Canon Carter's* remarks on the foregoing Letter . . . . . 286—289
Difference between an *intention* and a *vow* 288, 289

On English Cathedrals 290
Publication of the *Statutes* of *Lincoln Cathedral*, Preface to . 290—292
Table of Contents of Lincoln Cathedral Statutes . . . 293—301
Address to the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln Cathedral . . . 302
Visitation of the Cathedral 302, 303
Definition of a *Cathedral*, as distinguished from a *Parish Church* . 304
Relation of the Bishop to the Chapter 306

PAGE

Honorary Canons . . . . . 306, *note*
Constitution of Lincoln Cathedral—Definition of Chapter . 307—310
Residence of dignitaries 308
The Dean 308
The Precentor 308
The Chancellor 309
Lincoln and Iceland 309
The Treasurer 309
The Archdeacon 310
Canons and Prebendaries 310
Vicars 311
Causes of Decay of Cathedrals 312
The Bishop 312
By the Statutes, each Dignitary has specific duties 312
Act of 1840 314
Church Commissioners 315, 316
Cathedral Commissioners 315, 316
Term "*Canon*" 317
Practical suggestions . . . . . 318—322
The Bishop's relation to the Cathedral 319
Chancellor Massingberd 320
"Concilium Episcopi" 320, 321
Other suggestions . . . . . 321—323
"*Articles of Inquiry*" at the Visitation of the *Cathedral* . 323—325
On the *Studies of the Clergy* 326
Books recommended 329, 330
George Herbert—John Keble 331
Suggestions—County History, &c. 332
Domestic Economy—Marriage 333, 334
Speculation; debt—George Herbert's advice 335
"Association for Augmentation of Incomes of Poor Benefices" . 335

The Mission at Lincoln, 1876 337
Pastoral before the Mission . . . . . 337—342
Prayers for the Mission 342, 343
Address in the Cathedral to Missioners and Church-Workers . 344—349
St. Paul's Missionary method 347
Address in the Cathedral to the People during the Mission . 350—363
The two Great Missioners, and Missions . . . . . 350—356
Fruits of a Mission . . . . . 355—362
Prayer after the Mission 363
Pastoral after the Mission . . . . . 363—367

Pastoral to Wesleyan Methodists 368
Preface to it . . . . . 368—380
"Why does a Bishop write a Pastoral to the Wesleyans" . . 368
To what is Wesleyanism due? 368, 373
"Why does Augustine trouble us?" 369

PAGE

His answer to the question . . . . . 369—372
St. Augustine and the Donatists . . . . . 369—372
Application to the present case—Appeal to the Wesleyans . 372, 373
Allegations against the Church 373
What is Schism 374, 375, 378
Apostolical Succession . . . . . 374, 375, 389—392
Can Presbyters ordain? 375
The Wesleyans have not Presbyterian Ordination . . . 375—377
The title of "*Reverend*" 376
Stillingfleet's "Irenicum" 377
Do Wesleyans follow Wesley? 377
Case of Leighton and of Patrick 377, 378
Difference between English Wesleyans and foreign non-Episcopal Communities 378
Protestantism weakened, and Romanism and Infidelity strengthened, by the divisions of Protestants 378
Is Union possible? 378
Work of the Church in Lincoln Diocese; occasion of the Pastoral 380, 389
Confirmation at Epworth—Wesley's birthplace 381
In what sense are Wesleyans united with the Church . . . 381
John Wesley at Epworth. What would he now see there . 381, 382
Splits in Methodism 381
Would John Wesley be a Wesleyan? 382
Wesley's Language on Separation from the Church, and on his own Preachers 382, 383
His language and acts . . . . . 382—385
Wesley's Sermon on the Christian Priesthood . . . . 383—386
Wesley the Friend of *Lay Preachers* 385
Alteration of his Epitaph 385
His words on Schism 386
What would Wesley say to Wesleyanism 386, 387
Arguments of Wesleyans considered 387
On Sacraments received in Schism 387
Is Separation from the Church of England to be justified from the English Reformation? 388
What is to be done? 389
Prayer 391
Repentance 391
By the Wesleyans 391
Their position . . . . . 391—393
By Bishops and Clergy—Reflections on the Past 392
By the Laity 392
Position of their Ministers 393, 394
John Wesley's Ordinations 394, 395
Charles Wesley. Dr. Coke 394
Appeal to Holy Scripture, to Church History, and to the Head of the Church 396

PAGE

On the BURIALS QUESTION . . . . . 396—400, 429
Resolution passed at the Lincoln Diocesan Conference . . . 400

On LABOUR and CAPITAL 401
Agricultural and commercial distress—moral causes of . . 401, 402
Practical inferences 402
Struggle between Labour and Capital 402
Christian Principles applied to it 403, 404
Appeal to Christian Capitalists, and to others 404
What is to be done? . . . . . 404—407

On CAPITAL PUNISHMENT 408
Allegations against the translation—in our Bible—of the text in Gen. ix. 6 408
The true state of the case . . . . . 408—411
Objections to Capital Punishment 412
Consideration of objections to it, on grounds of mercy and of justice . . . . . 413—416
The real character of Murder . . . . . 412—414
The true office of the Christian Magistrate 416, 417
True Sympathy 417, 418
On Penal Servitude and Solitary Confinement, as compared with Capital punishment 419
Results of the abolition of Capital punishment 420
The true method to be used for the abolition of Capital Punishment . 421
Conclusion 421

On the CHURCH of ENGLAND, PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE . . 422
Reflexions at Cambridge, Nov. 18, 1877 422
Retrospect of the last half century 423
Change in popular view as to the foundation of Authority . . 423
Daniel's prophetic description of the Dynasties of the latter days . 423
Two forces opposed to Lawful Authority—Papal and Popular Supremacy 424
Change in the position of the English Church, how produced by political changes in the Imperial Legislature . . .
Disestablishment of Irish Church—Changes in Cathedral Bodies—Marriage Law—Popular Education; Dependency of the English Establishment on Scotland and Ireland 425, 426
What are the true grounds on which Authority rests? . . . 427
The Establishment exists for the sake of the Church—not *vice versâ* 428
Benefits of the Establishment 428
Probable evils of Disestablishment 428
Importance of the agricultural districts 429
Principles involved in *Burials Bill* 429
Prospects of the Latter Days 430, 431
The fall of Institutions a signal for the rising up of Individuals . 432
Grounds of hope for the future 433

PAGE

Good elicited from evil in various ways; as to doctrine, and discipline and inner life of the Church 433, 434
University Studies; uses of 434, 435
Appeal to the rising generation, especially in the Universities . 435, 436

Continuity of the Church of England—St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln 436
St. Hugh of Lincoln 436
Consecration of the Church of Clee, Lincolnshire, by him in 1192 . 436
Contemporary inscription in the Church 436
Address there in July 1878 436
The Lives of the Patriarchs were prophetical 436
Mysterious relation of Isaac to Abraham his father . . . 436, 437
Moriah 438
Beersheba 438
Spiritual Beershebas 439
Paradise, Sinai 439
Work of the Son of God, to reopen Beershebas 439
Examples—Marriage 439
Appeal to England 440
Application to the Church of England; and to the Reformation 440, 441
Ezek—Sitnah—Rehoboth 441
Application to her history 441
Missionary Enlargements—Colonial and American Episcopate—Lambeth Conference, 1878 . . . . . 441, 442
Application to Clee Church; and to St. Hugh's History . . . 442
His Apostolic and Evangelical character 443
Continuity of the Church of England; as compared with temporal dynasties 443
Warnings and Encouragements 444

Welcome from the Church of England to the Church of America—American Bishops at Lincoln (July, 1878) . . 445
Record of the Gift of the Eucharistic Alms-bason from the Church of America to the Church of England—Latin description of . . 445
English translation 448

Letter to the Oxford University Commissioners on Proposed New Statutes for Brasenose and Lincoln Colleges (1879) . . . 450
The purposes for which those Colleges were founded 450
Recent Sequestration of Ecclesiastical revenues 451
Need of Endowments for the Education of Clergy 452
Probable decline of sound scholarship, and of theological learning, in Candidates for Holy Orders; why to be especially deplored at the present time 453
On Clerical Headships and Clerical Fellowships 453
The English Colleges as places of higher Education 453
Reply to a majority of a Governing Body, as to a clerical Headship . 453

PAGE

Powers and duties of Visitors of Colleges transferred to the Commissioners—Future prospects 454

Letter of the Hundred Bishops at the Lambeth Conference, July, 1878 456
Greek and Latin translation of portions of the Letter . . 458—472
On the *practical utility* of the Greek and Latin Languages in modern times 474
The English Original of parts of the "Lambeth Letter" . . 475—480

Letter to the Archbishop of Cyprus 481

RELIGION IN SCIENCE.

Sir Isaac Newton was born at Woolsthorpe in the parish of Colsterworth, in the county of Lincoln, Dec. 25, A.D. 1642.

The following words were spoken in its church, on the occasion of its restoration (mainly by the energy of the present Rector, the Rev. John Mirehouse), on July 25, 1877 (St. James' Day), 150 years after Newton's death.

In the nineteenth Psalm the inspired author represents the natural world and the spiritual world as two books, written by one and the same Divine Hand. "The heavens declare the glory of God." The heavens have an apostolic office; they are messengers, heralds, preachers of the power and love of the Great Creator, and proclaim His praise. "Their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words into the ends of the world." The Holy Spirit speaking by St. Paul in the tenth chapter to the Romans teaches us to make this comparison by applying these words to the first preachers of the Gospel (Rom. x. 8). The Psalmist also compares days and nights to Evangelists announcing God's attributes in never-ceasing homilies of silent eloquence. And he says that in the midst of this glorious system is pavilioned the Sun, joyful as a bridegroom (words adopted in the New Testament, and applied to Christ, John i. 14; iii. 29), and exulting as a giant to do the work of God in cheering the world with his light and heat.

The Sun revolves round his axis, and although relatively fixed (or nearly so) as the centre of our system, may well be said to *go forth* by the influence of gravitation acting from him everywhere, and by the light and warmth of his rays penetrating into every part of that system.

Having described the glory of the heavens, the Psalmist passes on to speak of the *spiritual* world. God, Who

created the heavens, is also (he says) the Lord Jehovah, Who has given a perfect Law to man. By that Law He converts and strengthens the soul; by it He gives to us wisdom, light, purity, and joy; He cleanses the heart and sanctifies the will; and He Who is the Creator and Sanctifier of man, is also our *Redeemer;* and therefore the Psalmist thus concludes his Divine strain, "Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be alway acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my *Redeemer.*"

This Psalm is the first among those which are appointed by the Church to be used on the festival of Christmas Day. And very fitly; for Christ is the Eternal Word. St. John declares that "all things were made by Him" (John i. 3), and He, Who "in the beginning was with God, and Who is God, became Man for our sakes" (John i. 1, 14). He is "Emmanuel, God with us" (Matt. i. 23); "God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. iii. 16); "Of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace" (John i. 16); and by His Incarnation He, Who is the Eternal and Almighty Creator, became to us the Author and Giver of redemption and sanctification; the Fountain and Wellspring of light and life, of grace and wisdom, of joy and glory and immortality to the mind and heart of man.

On Christmas Day Isaac Newton was born in the year 1642, the year in which his great precursor, Galileo, died. And no one since the creation has ever so clearly unfolded, as Newton has done, the laws by which the material World (of which the Psalmist speaks in the former part of this Psalm) is regulated; or has done the work with more of that reverential and devout spirit of faith and love which is the fairest ornament of the Christian Philosopher, and which is the genuine fruit of that Divine grace and illumination which the Psalmist describes in the latter portion of this same sacred hymn, and which beamed on the world in Divine effulgence at the birth of Christ.

The thoughts which the Psalmist appears to suggest to us are as follows:—

Inasmuch as the natural World and the spiritual World are from the same Divine Being, it is probable that the

more we examine them both, the more evidences we shall recognize of similarity of plan, and of manifold analogies between them. In a word, is it not likely that the *natural world* (if we may so speak) is a *great parable—a parable of the world of grace?* The wise son of Sirach has said that "all things are double one against another, and God hath made nothing imperfect" (Ecclus. xlii. 24); and therefore he says, "So look on all the works of the Most High, and there are two and two, one against another" (Ecclus. xxxiii. 15). We know what uses were made of these wise sayings[1] by our own great moralist and metaphysician, Bishop Butler, in his "*Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed,*" and how he has applied these principles in that work for the refutation of sceptical objections to Christianity, and for the confirmation of Scriptural truths.

Let me now invite you to consider this. If the Newtonian Philosophy, with regard to natural phenomena, is true (as we believe it to be), may we not expect to find analogies and correspondences between it and Christianity? May we not expect to recognize analogies there which we do *not* find between *any other* system of Natural Philosophy and Christianity?

Let me illustrate this by an example.

Previously to the age of Isaac Newton the physical system generally accepted in our schools of science was the Ptolemaic; according to which the Earth was the centre around which the heavenly bodies revolved. But Newton demonstrated the error of that system, and established the truth of the Copernican system, which had been propounded more than two thousand years before by Pythagoras, and according to which the Sun is the centre, around which the Earth and other planetary bodies, with their satellites, revolve.

[1] See Bishop Halifax, Preface to his edition of Butler's Works, p. xxix, ed. Oxford, 1820. Bishop Butler (Introd. to "Analogy," p. 7, ibid.) ascribes also his own argument in part to a suggestion of Origen, who, "from analogical reasoning, has with singular sagacity observed that he who believes the Scripture to have proceeded from Him Who is the Author of Nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it as are found in the constitution of Nature."

Newton also proved that the Earth, with her satellite the Moon, and the other Planets with their satellites, are not luminous, but opaque, or dark, bodies; that they have no light of their own, and that they receive all their light, and all their warmth also, from the Sun, the centre of them all.

He also proved that they moved in one and the same direction (that is, from west to east), and that they all move around their axes in the same direction.

Now, if we open our Bibles, we shall, I think, perceive that the system of Nature, as explained by Newton, is a *parable* of what we read in Holy Scripture concerning the spiritual world. In Holy Scripture our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is called "the *Sun of Righteousness*" (Mal. iv. 2). He is "the *Light of the world*" (John viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 46). He it is (says St. John) Who is "the *true Light* which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (John i. 9).

At the Transfiguration, Moses and Elias, the representatives of those who lived under the Law and the Prophets, shone with heavenly radiance beaming forth from the glory of Christ (Luke ix. 28, 31), Whose "face did shine as the sun" (Matt. xvii. 2.) "Arise, shine, for Thy light is come," says Isaiah (lx. 1), prophesying of Christ; and "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light," exclaims the Apostle St. Paul (Ephes. v. 14). All these Scriptural expressions, derived from the natural World, would become meaningless and incongruous, if we were to accept the Ptolemaic system, which makes the Earth to be the centre, and the Sun and other heavenly bodies to be subordinate and tributary to it. But how beautiful and appropriate are they seen to be according to the Newtonian system, which makes the Sun (the Scriptural emblem of Christ) to be the one centre, around which the Earth, with her satellite the Moon, and the other Planets revolve; and to be also the one fountain and wellspring from which they derive their light and their warmth! Might we not say that if we accept the Psalmist's assertion that the two worlds of Nature and of Grace are like two volumes written by one and the same Divine Hand,

and are therefore in perfect accordance and beautiful harmony with each other, we might almost have anticipated and divined *à priori* the Newtonian theory as opposed to the Ptolemaic? However this may be, we recognize at once with thankfulness and joy the phenomena of the Natural World, when explained by Isaac Newton, as analogous to, and corresponding with, the revelations in both Testaments concerning Christ, the central Solar Orb, around which this dark and cold Planet of our own spiritual being, and the Moon of the Church herself (also dark and cold without Christ), and other planetary existences of spiritual life, revolve in their appointed orbits, and from which central solar orb of Christ they derive all the light and warmth of spiritual grace which they enjoy. May we not say, therefore, that Isaac Newton was not only an interpreter of Nature, but became an expositor of Scripture also? And may we not cherish the hope, that if it ever should please God to raise up other Newtons to unfold the secrets of Nature to our view, we may receive indirectly, by their means, fresh elucidations of divine beauty and truth in the mysteries of the world of grace as revealed in the Bible?

Let me now ask you to consider, how in another respect the phenomena of Nature, as explained by the philosophy of Newton, are like types and symbols of divine operations in the spiritual world.

Before the time of Newton it was generally supposed that the *celestial* bodies in our system were subjected to a different law from that which regulated *terrestrial* things. This was the Aristotelian theory; and as long as it prevailed, an impassable gulf of separation existed between heavenly and earthly mechanics, and there was little hope of successful research with regard to the motions of the heavenly bodies of our system.

Perhaps the greatest of all Newton's discoveries was that every particle of matter in our system attracts every other particle, and is attracted by it; and that the *heavenly* bodies of our system are governed by the *same law* which controls material substances upon *earth*; and that this law, the law of gravitation, which brings the apple down from the

branch of the tree, is the same law as that which regulates the Earth and other Planets in their orbits around the Sun, and even acts on what seem most erratic, the Comets themselves. And not only so, but that it acts in *the same manner*, and in *the same degree*, in *every part* of *the system*, namely, in the inverse ratio of the square of the distance from the object on which it acts. Consequently, the *more distant* a planet is from the sun, the more *slow* is its course in its orbit; and this variation of velocity is graduated according to a certain uniform law, expressed in the formula that the squares of the times of the revolutions of the planets round the sun vary as the cubes of their distances from it.

Perhaps the time may come when it may be recognized that these physical laws have their counterparts in the world of grace. "We now see through a glass darkly" (1 Cor. xiii. 12). But even now, with our feeble powers, we perceive some faint gleams and glimpses of them in the spiritual world.

For example, the Motion of the Earth round the Sun in a *curved elliptical orbit* is, according to the Newtonian philosophy, produced by the *composite action of two forces*, the one original, and which was applied once for all, but ever acts; the other constant, and continually applied at every moment. The one original force is that force of *projection* by which the Earth was, as it were, launched at the Creation, like a ball from the hand of the Creator, according to which it would (if left to itself) have travelled in a *straight line* through the medium of an unresisting ether for ever; the other force is that of *gravity*, by which it is continually acted upon by the Sun; and thus its course is modified, and by the joint action of these two forces it is kept, with hardly any deviation, in its elliptical orbit around the Sun, in which it has travelled for nearly six thousand years, and in which it goes on travelling, with undisturbed velocity, in quietness and peace.

Let us now open our Bibles. It is God's will that *man's will should be free*. Left to himself, Man moves in the straight line of freedom, derived (if we may so speak) from the projectile force by which he came forth originally from

the hand of the Creator. But in order that human *free-will* may be *exercised aright,* so as to keep man in the *orbit of duty,* he needs the continual influence of *Divine Grace,* operating upon him, as it were, *by centripetal force.* He needs the *spiritual gravitation of grace,* attracting him to the *central solar orb of the system, which is Christ.* The Apostle St. Paul describes the action of these two composite forces of human will and Divine grace, when he says, "*I laboured* more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the *grace* of God that was with me;" "*I can do* all things *through Christ*" (1 Cor. xv. 10. Phil. iv. 13). And he recognizes the union, and co-operation, of Divine grace with the human will in the tenour of a holy life when he says, "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. ii. 13).

Again, the *velocity* of the course of the Earth and other Planets, as well as their light and heat, depends on their *nearness to the Sun.* And who knows not that the more nearly we are brought to Christ, the more rapid and cheerful is our course in the orbit of our Christian duty; and the more distant we are from Christ, the slower do we become in our ways and works of spiritual life? But, although the Earth travels with different degrees of velocity in different parts of its orbit round the sun, yet it has been proved that it *describes equal areas* in *equal times.* May we not see a counterpart to this also in the World of Grace? If, like the planetary bodies, we are moving in the orbit of duty, according to God's will—though we may move with more or less rapidity at different times, yet in God's eye the area of our work is equal. Holy old age is no less acceptable to God than heroic youth. Moses praying on the hill, no less than Joshua fighting on the plain, works for Israel against Amalek. The Simeons and Annas of the Church serve no less than the Peters and Pauls. The contemplative love of St. John works with the practical zeal of St. Peter. The law in the army of God's Church is expressed by the command of David to his men, "As his part is that goeth down to the battle, so shall his part be that tarrieth by the

stuff: they shall part alike. This is a statute for Israel" (1 Sam. xxx. 24, 25).

Again, *that* theory of physical science which represents the world in which we live as the result of the concourse of independent atoms,—the Epicurean theory; and that other theory of vortices,—the Cartesian, and the more recent theory of spontaneous evolution, have no counterpart in the spiritual world as revealed to us in Holy Scripture. But, on the other hand, the discovery made by Isaac Newton that every particle of matter is connected with every other particle, and acts upon it, and that thus these particles together form *one grand harmonious whole*, has a beautiful antitype, if we may so speak, in what Holy Scripture teaches us concerning the union of all the families of man as derived from one stock, and much more, as joined together in one communion and fellowship in the mystical Body of Christ. We are not isolated atoms. We belong to one another. We attract and are attracted. Whatever we say or do has some influence on others. "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself," says St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 7); we are all fellow members in Christ (Rom. xii. 5. 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27. Ephes. iv. 25; v. 30). And as the Psalmist describes the heavens as having a missionary office, declaring the glory of God, so it may be said of the system of the World as explained by the philosophy of Newton, demonstrating the mutual connexion of all its constituent parts, and the functions performed by every several part, in sustaining and animating the whole, that it symbolizes, as it were, that work of spiritual love and evangelical zeal, which energizes in the body of Christ for the edification of that body and of the whole family of man, by Christian Missions at home and abroad.

And here we may see a reply to the Sadducean scepticism and secularism of the present age. Some, alas! there are who deny that there is such a thing as regenerating grace imparted to the soul of an infant in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. Some will not believe in the gift of the Holy Ghost in Confirmation. Some doubt the existence of that cleansing and refreshing grace, which is a pledge and

earnest of Resurrection and Immortality, and which is given to the faithful, penitent, and loving communicant in the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Some deny the infusion of grace into the devout soul, in prayer and praise and holy meditation, and in hearing and reading of God's most Holy Word. They cannot (they say) *trace the origin and sequence* or mode of working of this spiritual grace; and *therefore* they will *not believe* that it *exists.*

But let us ask such reasoners as these, Can *they discern* the *origin of gravitation?* Can they trace the mode of *its* working? They cannot do so. Isaac Newton himself, at the end of his *Principia,*[2] distinctly affirms that he "knows *nothing of the reason of the properties of gravity;*" and yet he no less emphatically affirms that it *exists everywhere* in our planetary system and regulates the whole. It is enough for us (he adds) to know this. We say the same of *Grace,* which is the gravitation of the soul.

Let us pass to another point.

Many fallacies have been produced in the popular mind by the common use of the terms, "*Laws of Nature,*" "*Laws of Matter,*" and the like.

On account of the loose and inaccurate use of the word "*Law,*" many are apt to forget the personal existence and continued action of the Divine *Lawgiver.* Bishop Butler says[3] "the universal prevalence of Cartes' absurd notions, teaching that Matter is necessarily infinite, and necessarily eternal, and ascribing all things to *mere mechanic laws of matter,* exclusive of a final cause, and of all will and intelligence and Divine Providence from the government of the world, hath incredibly blinded the eyes of common reason, and prevented men from discerning Him, '*in Whom they live, and move, and have their being*'" (Acts xvii. 28). Men suffer Divine dynamics to be absorbed up into material mechanics. Our Blessed Lord says, "My Father *worketh*

[2] *Rationem* harum gravitatis proprietatum ex phænomenis nondum potui deducere, et hypotheses non fingo. Satis est quod gravitas reverà existat, et agat, et ad corporum celestium et maris nostri motus omnes sufficiat.—Newton, Principia, p. 530, Lond., 1726, ed. tert.

[3] Bishop Butler, "Letter to Dr. Clarke," Works, ii. 590.

hitherto, and I work" John v. 17). Almighty God has created nothing new since the first sabbath of creation, but He has never ceased to act, in the preservation and direction of every part of the system of the universe which He then created.

The word "*Law*" applied to the natural world ought to be considered as having a relation to our finite human understandings, rather than to the Divine power and will of the Creator. And our great Christian Philosopher, Isaac Newton, has taken care to remind us of this. He has indeed unfolded to us the *law* of gravitation, (or, in other words, the general method of the Divine action) in our own planetary system. But he has also shown us that this law does not bind the Creator, but only governs those creatures upon which the law is imposed by Him. He has declared to us the fact that the *fixed stars* are *not* subject to the same law of gravitation: and thus he has declared to us the perfect freedom and independent omnipotence of the Divine Creator. What can have produced the result, that while the *planets* all gravitate to each other and to the sun, the *fixed stars* are retained in their places for thousands of years without any change in their relations to each other? The answer is, It is the will of God.

And here, with reverence be it said, in what we know of the spiritual world from Holy Scripture, we have a counterpart to this difference between the planets and the fixed stars. We *men,* in this moral and spiritual system of ours (which is our transitory period of probationary existence and preparation for Eternity), have an appointed work to do, a course to run, an orbit of duty in which to revolve around the Solar Orb of Christ's glorious light. This has been the case with Man ever since the creation. Christ has ever been the centre of our spiritual system; Adam, Abel, Abraham, all the Patriarchs and Prophets, as well as the Apostles and Evangelists, looked with faith to Christ. All revolved around Him; all gravitated to Him as their centre. They had a planetary life, as we have. But there are other blessed spirits, whose work is done; spirits who cannot sin; spirits who can never fall. These are the "elect angels"

(1 Tim. v. 21). These are the *fixed stars* in the spiritual firmament, shining brightly in their several places for eternity. We too, who are now like planets moving in our paths of duty, if we continue faithful in our orbits, revolving around Christ, may one day be transfigured into *fixed stars*. and shine brightly for evermore. As the prophet Daniel says, "They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the *stars for ever and ever*" (Daniel xii. 3).

My friends, in this parish of Colsterworth Newton was born on Christmas Day; in that baptismal font Newton was christened on New Year's Day, the festival of Christ's Circumcision, 1643; in this church Newton prayed to God, and praised Him, and listened to His Holy Word. At Woolsthorpe in this parish he formed the first conception (may we not call it a vision from above?) of that great law of gravitation by which he afterwards solved the problem of the system in which we live. From this parish he went in the year 1660 to Trinity College, Cambridge, where by God's providence he was placed under the tuition of one of the greatest mathematicians and theologians of the age, Isaac Barrow, whom in 1669 he succeeded in his mathematical professorship. Barrow became Master of his College in 1672. But to return to Newton. He, who was endued by God with perhaps the greatest philosophical genius vouchsafed to man, retained the meekness and humility of a child; and looking back on a long life extended to eighty-five years (and which was ended in 1727, just one hundred and fifty years ago), and speaking of his own marvellous scientific researches and discoveries, he said, with more marvellous humility, "After all, I have only been like a little child picking up a few pebbles on the sea-shore of the great ocean of truth."

In our own days, when some who are called philosophers would separate physical science from revealed religion, and would represent philosophy as hostile to Christianity, and seem to have unbounded confidence in themselves, let us comfort our hearts and strengthen our faith by the example

and testimony of Newton. Of all philosophers that ever lived, he was the least likely to be deceived. For, unlike many of his predecessors he never built anything *on hypothesis* (as some philophers now do), "*hypotheses non fingo*," was his maxim; but he reasoned from *known phenomena*. And he pursued his researches with that cautious self-distrust, modesty, and patience, which when joined with intellectual power, are the best guarantees of success, which is a gift of God, Who hides himself from the proud and gives grace and wisdom to the humble.

You will remember with what reverent and devout words Newton closes his *Principia*. Having recapitulated the principles of his own physical system, he says, "All these things are ruled by God, not as the soul of the world" (which is the theory of the Pantheist), "but as the Lord of all. He it is Who is called the Lord God Almighty; God of gods and Lord of lords. He is the living God, Infinite, Almighty, Omniscient, Omnipresent, and Eternal; Whom we know by His attributes, and by His all-wise and beneficent works, and by means of final causes: Whom we admire for His perfections, and Whom, as Lord of all, we worship and adore!"

This Church, now happily restored, is an appropriate monument of the greatest of Christian Philosophers. Let us show our thankfulness to God, Who gave a Newton to us, to England, and to the World, by liberal contributions this day. And let us look beyond it, and above it, to the Church glorified in heaven, where all true worshippers will enjoy eternal blessedness and glory. The hour is coming when all these material fabrics will be no more; the hour is coming when the great material temple of the Universe, in which Newton was a devout worshipper and venerable hierarch, will be dissolved; the hour is coming when (as St. Peter speaks) "the heavens themselves will pass away with a great noise, and the elements will melt with fervent heat, and the earth and all things therein will be burned up" (2 Peter iii. 10); and then, if we have been faithful to Christ, by Whom all things were made, by Whom al

Men have been redeemed, and by Whose spirit we are sanctified, we shall be admitted to dwell together with good and holy men, with blessed saints and angels in happiness and glory, and to worship the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Persons and One God, blessed for evermore.

RELIGIOUS USES OF CLASSICAL STUDIES.

On this subject I had occasion to offer some remarks in publishing an Edition of Theocritus. The following is the Preface to the second edition printed in the year 1877 :—

Ad hanc alteram editionem adornandam nova quædam mihi suppetebant subsidia, quæ in priore instruendâ præsto non erant. Etenim his recentioribus annis ad Theocriti scripta illustranda accesserunt viri ingenio et doctrinâ insignes, præsertim in Germaniâ, ex quorum laboribus fructus uberes percipere licuit, eorum vestigiis insistenti. Vidi etiam non sine jucundo quodam animi affectu adnotationes nostras a nuperrimo et eruditissimo Theocriti Editore non indignas existimari quæ non tantum commemorarentur, verum etiam, delectu earum habito, in suam editionem reciperentur. Profuit quoque mihi meos labores recognoscenti eorum judicia de meis qualibuscunque in Theocrito recensendo tentaminibus resciscere, ita ut si quibus calculum suum adjecissent, de iis spem concipere auderem meliorem, et si quos ii obelo non injuriâ notavissent, eos retractandos censerem. Unde contigit ut secundam hanc Theocriti nostri editionem, etsi non qualem vellem, at saltem qualem minus nollem, tuo favori, lector benev ole, commendare in animum induxerim. Cui quidem proposito exsequendo, cum gravioribus negotiis continuò implicarer, multa se opposuerunt. Sed tandem voti solvendi occasionem nactus manum ad opus admovi.

Theocritum lectitâsse existimari potest, ex venustissimis ipsius carminibus, vir sanctissimus et disertissimus Gregorius Nazianzenus, Antistes Constantinopolitanus. Magnus ille Basilius Cæsareæ in Cappadociâ Archiepiscopus, qui cum Nazianzeno familiarissimè vixit, de Gentilium libris legendis

luculentam dissertationem edidit.[1] Basilii æqualis, illustris ille Præsul Mediolanensis, Sanctus Ambrosius, in præclaris Hexämerôn libris, hortulos suos ex Virgilii Eclogis et Georgicis irrigâsse videtur. Gregorii Nazianzeni auditor Sanctus Hieronymus, satis rigidus alioquin morum censor, multus erat in scriptis Græcorum et Latinorum evolvendis, et de his literis excolendis doctam epistolam evulgavit.[2] Sanctus Augustinus, Hipponensis Episcopus, in egregiis de doctrinâ Christianâ libris,[3] de eâdem re sapienter et eleganter disseruit.

Equidem persuasissimum habeo Christianæ Ecclesiæ optimè consultum iri, si hæc studia, quæ in antiquarum linguarum exactâ cognitione, tanquam in optimo humani intellectûs exercendi et informandi gymnasio et quasi palæstrâ, et quæ in Græcorum et Romanorum scriptis assiduè evolvendis et accuratè interpretandis versantur, non obsolescere patiatur, sed potius ea materno amore fovere et impensâ diligentiâ promovere conetur. Nobis certè non invideri debet, si eâ libertate utamur, quæ summis Ecclesiæ primitivæ rectoribus est concessa, et studiis hisce jucundissimis, quæ adolescentiam nostram aluerunt, senectutem aliquantisper oblectemus.

Quid autem si non diffiteamur in Theocrito nostro non pauca deprehendi, quæ non tantum minus proba et decora sint, sed etiam fœda et turpia, et quæ justum verecundiæ sensum graviter offendant? Verum enimvero regerere liceat, quemadmodum in rebus physicis etiam e venenis noxiis pharmaca solent elici salutaria, ita quoque ex his locis vitiosis enucleari possunt moralia quædam medicamenta, ad salutem promovendam idonea, et nostris præcipue temporibus non infructuosa.

Etenim cum ad talia animum advertamus, quæ scriptorum ethnicorum etiam celeberrimorum scripta deturpant, et lucidissimo eorum candori maculas quasi adspergunt, et præcipuè poetarum ingenio et styli venustate et colorum

[1] S. Basil. Homil. xxii. p. 173, tom. ii., ed. Paris, 1722.

[2] S. Hieronymus, ad Magnum Oratorem, Epist. 83, p. 654, tom. iv., ed. Paris, 1706.

[3] S. Augustinus, de Doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. ii. ad finem.

quasi festivâ hilaritate et versuum numerosissimâ suavitate commendatissimorum, haud facilem aurem iis præbebimus, qui hodie nobis pollicentur et persuadere conantur, nos a vitiorum fœditate immunes fore, et virtutibus moralibus inclarescere posse, si modo nos et populares nostros secularibus studiis et artibus elegantioribus, et philosophiæ placitis, et literarum humaniorum culturæ totos mancipemus. Qui quidem error exitiosissimus ex his ipsis ethnicorum libris efficacissimè potest refelli.

Hæc studia, nullo non honore prosequenda, et nullâ non diligentiâ excolenda, ubicunque cum verâ religione consocientur, et quasi famulentur pietati, et cælestis gratiæ splendore illuminentur et rore pluviâque irrigentur, contra autem, si per se segregentur, et in quandam terrenam et quasi silvestrem solitudinem ex Civitate Dei abigantur, effrenatè, petulanter et intemperanter gestire solent, et animalium sensuum et appetituum naturalium indulgentiâ luxuriare et lascivire, et quasi belluino more efferari. Huic sententiæ adstipulari videtur universa mundi antiquitas. Unde rectè colligitur, rationem hominis et voluntatem, utcunque naturalibus dotibus instructam atque adornatam, ad societatem humanam clarificandam, purificandam atque illuminandam, et ad rem publicam instaurandam et conservandam, non esse idoneas.

Liceat etiam aliud adjicere quod a re, de quâ agitur, non alienum esse videtur.

Cum Theocriti et similium scriptorum pietatem in Deos suos qualescunque oculis contemplamur,[4] et eorum sensum pulchritudinis naturalis exquisitum elucentis in rivis limpidis, prata floribus picta recreantibus, et in vallibus herbosis, ministrantibus ubertim pascua gregibus niveis et armentis boum validis, et in speluncis vivisque lacubus, et pastorum mentes largo quasi lætitiæ flumine perfundentibus, et cum aure percipimus vocem naturalis pietatis, in versibus eorum suavissimis ad Faunos Nymphasque, fontium, rivorum et montium amatores, sese exprimentis et effundentis, cuinam non illicò succurrit non injucunda cogitatio,—Ecquid a talibus scriptoribus expectandum fuisset, si harum omnium rerum

[4] Cujus exemplum insigne habes in Idyllio illo pulcherrimo vii. 34, 155. Conferas, quæso, x. 42.

Conditorem Optimum Maximum, et tantorum bonorum Largitorem munificentissimum, Deum, ex oraculis Ipsius divinitùs inspiratis cognovisse, et hac luce veritatis frui, quæ nobis illuxit, licuisset? Dicam etiam audacter quod sentio. Ecquis non potius admiratur diligitque vitam Theocriteorum pastorum, in rupe maris Siculi, vel in gramine ad ripas Anapi sedentium, vel ad fontem sub pinûs susurrantis umbraculo, vel sub frondosarum ulmorum et populorum albarum hospitio, post anni fruges conditas, Thalysia lætè celebrantium,[5] et carmina numinibus suis, fistulâ adspirante, canentium, quàm illorum philosophorum, qui, post splendorem divini aspectûs in Verbo Veritatis revelatum, in obscurâ caligine errare contenti sunt, et in formidoloso et inhospitali barathro volutare rerum naturalium et causarum secundarum, a divino intellectu, amore, et potentiâ Conditoris, Qui, ut cum Newtono[6] nostro loquar, "omnia regit, non ut anima mundi, sed universorum Dominus," longè latèque remotarum?

Sed hæc hactenus. Ignoscant mihi velim lectores benevoli talia aliis insinuanti, quæ ipsi sibi fortassè præcipere aptius et melius potuissent. Scribebam Riseholmiæ propè Lincolniam, in Festo Epiphaniæ, Anno Salutis MDCCCLXXVII.

The following paragraphs are from the Preface to my former Edition of Theocritus:—

Septennium jam effluxit ex quo de recensendis Theocriti Reliquiis cogitare cœpi. Cujus quidem consilii complures extitere causæ; primùm, ut harum Literarum studia pro virili parte juvare conarer; deinde, ut, cùm severioribus studiis et gravioribus negotiis implicarer, Scriptorem aliquem styli venustate et hilaritate et candore ingenii commendabilem, qualem esse Theocritum omnes censuerunt, præ manibus haberem, quo animum subinde acquiescentem exercerem simul et recrearem.

Persuadebam quoque mihi, quod a gravissimis auctoribus traditum accepimus, indigestam variarum scientiarum leviter degustatarum notitiam adeò nihil ad mentes Adolescentium

[5] Theocr. Idyll. vii. ad fin.

[6] Isaaci Newtoni Principia, ad finem; p. 528, ed. Lond. 1726.

rectè informandas valere, ut contrà cas faciat vel effæminato languore flaccessere, vel volubili inconstantiâ fluitare, ne dicam temerariâ arrogantiâ superbire; et nihil unquam verè solidi et diuturni in iis præsertim studiis, quæ jure primum obtinent locum, Sacrarum inquam Literarum et Theologiæ, effici posse, omnia autem, quæ in his attentarentur, infirma, incerta et infructuosa fore, si fundamenta, a majoribus nostris in accuratâ Antiquarum Literarum cognitione sapientissimè jacta, labi aut vacillare pateremur.

Quare Angliæ nostræ, quùm in aliis rebus, quæ ad Religionem pertinent, tum in hâc quoque egregiam felicitatem magnoperè prædicandam esse arbitror, quod in Scholarum et Academiarum suarum disciplinis instituendis, Linguarum Antiquarum studia, universæ humanitatis, præcipuè autem Theologicæ scientiæ, substructionem esse voluerit; unde Patriæ nostræ post literas renatas semper licuit gloriari, se Viros aluisse et hodie alere, non in profanis tantùm literis summâ cum laude versatos, sed eosdem sacræ eruditionis famâ florentissimos. Quis, ut recentiores taceam, quis non affectu quodam lætitiæ se commoveri sentiat, quùm Usserios, Waltonos, Gatakeros animo recolat, quùm Savilios, Hammondos, Pearsonos, Bentleios, Davisios, et, si de adoptivis loqui liceat, quùm Casaubonos, Grabios; quorum insistere vestigiis videtur esse gloriosissimum; et ut aliqui semper reperiantur, qui eadem arma tractent, quibus illi feliciter usi sunt, et validis sanæ doctrinæ propugnaculis Religionem puram et incorruptam tueantur, Ecclesiæ et Reipublicæ sanè est saluberrimum.

Itaque tantum abest, ut hæc sæcularia studia, tanquam res non summi momenti, unquam negligenda esse videantur; ut, quùm teterrima pestis Literas et universam hominum societatem sit invasura, si quando ii, qui se Criticos appellari volunt, Theologica studia invidiosè elevaverint, ita non minus exitiabilis futura sit illa perversitas, si unquam homines sibi nihil Philologiâ opus esse jactitent, quin præclari Theologi fiant. Mihi quidem si, salvâ verecundiâ, quid sentiam eloqui liceat, hæc ab illis studia, in adolescentium præcipuè Institutione, non modo nunquam segreganda esse, verùm etiam, si fieri posset, arctiore adhuc cum iis societate

jungenda videntur; et illud potius semper placuit, quod a non nimis æquo profanarum disciplinarum censore, Tertulliano, quæri videmus, "*Quomodo repudiamus sæcularia studia, sine quibus divina esse non possunt?*"[7]

Quæ cùm ita sint, nullâ magis aliâ ratione hæc studia adolescentium animis arbitrabar me posse commendare, quàm si probatum aliquem Scriptorem, qui eos suavitate alliceret, ad Codicum fidem accuratè recenserem, et rationibus identidem expositis, quæ apud me in lectionibus deligendis valuissent, quàm emendatissimum iis repræsentarem.

Ut autem Theocritum potissimum edendum susciperem, præter causas jam a me memoratas, alia me impulit ratio. Cernebam enim locupletissimam messem Variarum Lectionum, e MSS. Theocriti enotatarum, a Viris doctis jam esse collectam; sed tamen, si ita loqui liceat, in horreo etiam nunc penè intactam jacere, et areæ criticæ tribulum et ventilabrum adhuc expectare.

HORACE.

Let me now be allowed to illustrate the moral and religious uses of Classical Literature by reference to the works of a Roman Author, Horace, which do not appear to be duly appreciated in this respect. The popular view of the character of Horace seems to be this, that he was endued with much liveliness of fancy, well trained by the study of Greek Literature, gifted with extraordinary felicity and graceful elegance of language, with happy versatility of metrical skill, with refined delicacy of taste, and courtesy of manner, that he exercised his poetical gifts in light and amatory verses, ministering to the indulgence of sensual appetites; that he was a man of the world, a libertine, and an epicure; but was wholly deficient in earnestness of purpose, and seriousness of character. To this common estimate of him I would venture respectfully to demur. I would not pretend to say that his life was not sullied and tainted with

[7] Tertullian. de Idololatriâ, c. 10.

the stain of certain vices, which, in his age and country (such was the moral corruption of the most illustrious heathen nations in their palmiest days), were not regarded as vices at all.[8] But it has been well observed by Bentley, in the preface to his edition of Horace, that in proportion as Horace advanced in years, so his poems improved in moral tone, and elevation of sentiment. And the late Alexander Knox, in an excellent paper (printed in his Remains, vol. i. pp. 7—17) points out that Horace gives utterance to a pensive consciousness of the hollowness of worldly pleasures and animal enjoyments, and of the palling satiety and weary listlessness (veternum) and jaded exhaustion of body and mind produced by them, and gives vent to an intense craving for something beyond them, to satisfy the longings of his soul; and that he describes, in language of bitter disappointment, his own moral condition; that he was like a man searching for something beyond himself which he could not find, and that he was groping in the dark for some object of eager desire which he was sure existed, but which eluded his grasp.[9] The limits of this paper will not allow me to develope this opinion as fully as I could wish; let me state briefly what that opinion is.

Horace was honoured with the friendship of the Emperor Augustus, and of his Prime Minister Mæcenas, and of his noble friend Agrippa.

It would seem as if Augustus was raised up by Divine Providence, and was continued in his proud pre-eminence as Master of the World for forty years, in order to show what *can* —and also to display what *can not*—be done by unlimited military and naval power and prowess, and by diplomatic prudence and able State policy, and salutary Legislation,[1] assisted by human skill, intelligence, and genius in Literature and the Arts,—for the restoration and preservation of National Institutions.[1]

[8] See Hor. 1 Sat. iv. 113, and below, p. 26, and p. 28.

[9] See 2 Ode xvi. Otium Divos, &c, and 1 Epist. i. 23—65; 1 Epist. viii. 7, 10; 2 Epistle ii. 141, &c.; 175, &c.; 200, &e.

[1] For evidence of this, see the Life of Augustus by Suetonius, and the history of Dio Cassius; the reader will find them quoted in Dean Merivale's Rome, vol. iv. p. 33—45, ed. 1856.

It has not, I think, been duly considered, that Horace (and the same may be said also of Virgil) endeavoured, especially in the third and fourth Books of his Odes, and in the two Books of his Epistles (probably at the suggestion of Augustus himself) to perform the work of recommending, by all the powers of his poetical genius, the Imperial state policy and the Augustan Legislation, to the favourable acceptance of the Roman People. Many of the Odes and Epistles of Horace may be regarded as serving the purpose (may I use the expression?) of political pamphlets; or as leading articles in Newspapers or Reviews, and as having therefore an earnest and serious design. They were intended, I believe, to panegyrize the principles, and to popularize the enactments, by which Augustus endeavoured to save the Roman State from the dark abyss of moral corruption, which yawned beneath his feet, and to endue the Nation with fresh vitality and vigour.

In order to co-operate with his imperial Master in this glorious enterprise (rendered more difficult by the prevalence of Epicureanism and Stoicism), Horace enunciated the grand fundamental principle of all Law and Order, namely, that all Civil Authority is from above, and is based on a religious recognition of the supremacy of God. How noble is his utterance (addressed to Rome), almost like an anticipation of St. Paul's thirteenth chapter to the Romans :—

> "Dis te minorem quod geris imperas :
> Hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum ;
> Di multâ neglecti dederunt
> Hesperiæ mala luctuosæ.
> Jam bis Moneses et Pacori manus, &c." (3 Od. vi. 5.)

Reverence for the Deity was to be shown by religious devotion and by Public Worship, and therefore Horace would assist, with his poetical genius, the efforts of Augustus to rebuild the sacred fabrics of the Temples at Rome.

> "Delicta majorum immeritus lues,
> Romane, donec templa refeceris,
> Ædesque labentes Deorum, et
> Fœda nigro simulacra fumo." (3 Od. vi. 1.)

Compare 2 Od. xv. 17, where he speaks of Laws,

> "Oppida publico
> Sumptu jubentes et Deorum
> Templa novo decorare saxo."

And his question to the Roman Capitalist,

> "Cur eget indignus quisquam, te divite? Quare
> Templa ruunt antiqua Deûm?" (2 Sat. ii. 104.)

Selfishness and Avarice, seen in miserly hoarding of money, and in griping, greedy, and usurious money-lending; and Vainglory shown in profuse expense in building, in gardens, in baths, in the luxury of the table; these vices were sapping the vitals of Roman Society, and were preparing it for dissolution. Augustus, by his legislation, endeavoured to counteract them. And the Sabine bard seconded him in his attempt. How nobly does Horace commend to his Roman readers the virtue of patriotism by such lines as—

> "Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori:" (3 Od. ii. 13.)

and by promising them immortality for noble deeds,

> "Virtus recludens immeritis mori
> Cælum, &c." (3 Od. ii. 21.)

and by the sublime example of Regulus; (3 Od. v. 13, &c.). How grand is his appeal to the stern and hardy virtues of self-denial and self-sacrifice of their ancestors, women as well as men,

> "Privatus illis census erat brevis,
> Commune magnum." (2 Od. xv. 13.)

Compare that other magnificent appeal to the heroic past,

> "Non his juventus orta parentibus
> Infecit æquor sanguine Punico,
> Pyrrhumque et ingentem cecidit
> Antiochum Hannibalemque dirum;
> Sed rusticorum mascula militum
> Proles, Sabellis docta ligonibus

Versare glebas, et severæ
Matris ad arbitrium recisos
Portare fustes, sol ubi montium
Mutaret umbras, et juga demeret
Bobus fatigatis, amicum
Tempus agens abeunte curru."
(3 Od. vi. 33—44.)

How powerfully does he endeavour to raise them from the grovelling slavery of money-getting, and from pampering the animal appetite, by setting before them the unprofitableness of worldly riches hoarded in sordid penury, on the one hand, and on the other, of profuse prodigality in sumptuous surfeiting; and by describing the wealth of contentment, and the pleasures of simplicity of living, and the joys of a country life;

See 2 Od. ii.; 2 Od. xiv.; 2 Od. xviii. See 3 Od. i. and 3 Od. ii.; 3 Od. xvi. 17—44.; 3 Od. xxiv. 49—51. 4 Od. ix. 45—52. Epod. ii. and xvi.

Horace traces the moral corruption of Roman Society to the desecration of Marriage, and to the prevalence of Adultery;

"Fecunda culpæ secula nuptias
Primum inquinavere, et genus et domos;
Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populumque fluxit." (3 Od. vi. 17.)

He therefore would do all in his power to recommend to general acceptance the laws of Augustus (called the "Julian Laws," 4 Od. xv. 22), for the encouragement and restoration of Marriage, and for the punishment of the sin of conjugal infidelity. He eulogizes those Laws as the wisest enactments of imperial legislation. Referring to them he says to Augustus

"Cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus,
Res Italas armis tuteris, moribus ornes,
Legibus emendes, etc." (2 Epist. i. 1.)

And he rejoices in the thought of their beneficial effects;

"Nullis polluitur casta domus stupris,
Mos et Lex maculosum edomuit nefas;
Laudantur simili prole puerperæ,
Culpam pœna premit comes." (4 Od. v. 21.)

and

"Tua, Cæsar, ætas
Janum Quirini clausit, et ordinem
Rectum evaganti frena licentiæ
Injecit, emovitque culpas,
Et veteres revocavit artes." (4 Od. xv. 4.)

Compare the Carmen Seculare v. 19, 45, 56, and the noble lines,

"O quis, quis volet impias
Cædes et rabiem tollere civicam?
Si quæret PATER URBIUM
Subscribi statuis, indomitam audeat
Refrenare licentiam,
Clarus postgenitis." (3 Od. xxiv. 25.)

Augustus had many difficulties to contend with, in applying these Laws; and Horace, I conceive, is referring to his perseverance in this respect, in the magnificent Ode which describes

"Justum et tenacem propositi virum."
(3 Od. iii. 1, see *v.* 11.)

That Horace had a lofty conception of the dignity of his own office as a Poet, and as a Teacher and Prophet to his own country and age, is clear from his interesting and instructive description of the duties of a Poet, in one of his Epistles to Augustus,

"Vatis avarus
Non temere est animus, &c." (2 Epist. i. 119—138.)

The passage is too long to quote, but it deserves to be carefully studied as a portrait of Horace, drawn by himself, in one of his soberest and most serious moods.

Let me add two other traits: first, his veneration and

love for his father, who in a low rank of society, and a poor estate, had a wise mind, and large heart, and generously exercised self-denial for the sake of educating his child, the future Lyric bard, at a good school under the best masters at Rome, and watched over him there with parental vigilance and tenderness, and guarded and guided him with prudent counsels when there. Let the reader be requested to look at the following passages: 1 Sat. iv. 105—125; vi. 64—99; and 2 Epist. ii. 41—54. How noble is this filial affection and reverence in a heathen. Horace, the most popular Poet of Rome, the friend and favourite of Mæcenas and of Augustus, the admired of all admirers among courtly clients, is not ashamed of the humble station and poverty of his father; no, he tells them that he preferred such a parent to the noblest founders of the patrician houses of Rome.

The second noticeable point is, that Horace did not rely on himself for poetical inspiration. He looked upward; and, in a wise spirit of lowly modesty, he ascribed all his gifts and his fame to a divine power. (See 4 Od. iii. 17—24; cp. 3 Od. iv. 21, 36.) What would Horace have been, if he had enjoyed the blessings of Christian teaching, and of spiritual grace, in Holy Scripture, and in Prayer, and in the Sacraments?

What are the practical inferences from these facts? The Augustan legislation,—backed though it was by every aid that human power, skill, perseverance, and genius could supply,—failed in its endeavours to preserve Roman Society from moral corruption, and to save the Roman State from decay and ultimate dissolution. Augustus had to mourn over its failure, even in his own family.

But soon afterwards Christianity appeared; it came forth in lowly meekness; but it did for Society what the Imperial Master of the World had attempted in vain.

Consider, for example, the institution of Marriage, the fountain and well-spring of all domestic peace and happiness. The Eternal Son of God, by His Incarnation, has consecrated Womanhood, and has sanctified Marriage to be a figure of his own mystical union with the Church. And the Church,

by preaching that doctrine, and by declaring that the body of the Christian becomes by Baptism a member of Christ, and a temple of the Holy Ghost, and will be raised from the grave hereafter, and be made like the glorified body of Christ[2] (if it has been dedicated to Him and used in His service), has, as it were, leavened the mass of human society, and has purified and changed it to a new and holy existence, and has given it peace and joy in this world, and hopes full of immortality in the next.

Human Reason, Power, and Genius did what they could, by Augustus. But they could not reach beyond certain limits. They endeavoured to restore Marriage: but they did not even attempt to restrain Harlotry, and to eradicate that terrible sin which St. Paul has mentioned in his dark catalogue of the vices of heathendom.[3] Horace, even in his most earnest efforts on behalf of Marriage, in the third and fourth books of his Odes, has delivered no protest against those sins; but the contrary. The rigid edicts of Augustan legislation, and the poetical genius of the Augustan age did absolutely nothing—attempted nothing—for the emancipation of Mankind from the debasing slavery of those sins. Yet still God strove with them and in them. The searchings after Him, the cravings for light, the noble assertions which have been already quoted from Horace of the doctrine of a Divine Supremacy in human States, and of the need of subordination in Governments to the Divine Will, and of the maintenance of public worship in sacred fabrics dedicated to the Divine honour; the declarations of the honour to be paid to Marriage, as the source of public and private happiness, and the denunciations of severe penalties to conjugal unfaithfulness, and the proclamation of the dignity of self-denial and self-sacrifice, of plain living and of high thinking, and of the necessity of divine help, inspiring holy thoughts and enabling to do noble deeds—these are witnesses of great truths, and render the study of Horace profitable and delightful to all.

They also read in the ears of Christian England a solemn

[2] 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19, 20. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Eph. ii. 6; v. 3, 4, 22—32. Phil. iii. 21. Col. iii. 1—4. 1 John iii. 2, 3.

[3] Rom. i. 27. 1 Tim. i. 10.

warning, that if she imagines that Literature, Science, and the Fine Arts (things deserving of all honour in their proper place and degree); that tact and courtesy and gentlemanly manners will save her from moral decay and socialand national dissolution; if she dallies with Positivism, Pantheism, or Materialism; if she relies on secular teaching in her Elementary Schools in her towns, and in her Colleges and Universities; if she thinks that she can educate without the Scriptures and Prayers and the Creeds; if she discards from her School System the dogmatic truths of Christianity concerning the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Baptismal Covenant, the doctrine of Communion with Christ in the Holy Eucharist, and of the Resurrection of the Body, and the consequent sanctity of Marriage, and the sinfulness of Harlotry and Intemperance; if she forgets the Supremacy of Almighty God in the affairs of a Nation; and if she ceases to perceive the necessity of the practical acknowledgment of that Supremacy in her national Councils, and by maintaining her national faith and worship; if she gives facilities to Divorce, and connives at Adultery, and makes it to be an occasion for another Marriage, and for another breach of it; if she legalizes Marriages which God has declared to be incestuous: if she desecrates the Lord's Day, and secularizes and profanes the Places dedicated to Him,—her churches and her churchyards,—she will sink into as bad a state as that of heathen Rome as described in Holy Scripture.

It is with reluctance that I touch on the following topic at all; but in times when many persons seem to forget what we owe in *social* and *domestic* respects to Christianity, and appear to think that Christianity is only one among many successive forms of belief, and that we may part with the teaching of definite Christian dogmas in our systems of popular Instruction, and may substitute something else in its place, it ought to be borne in mind that Christianity manifested its courage, and its consciousness of its Divine origin, in the great cities of Italy and Greece, by its bold protest against Harlotry, and against a worse sin.

The Augustan Legislation did indeed make a struggle,—a strenuous but unsuccessful one—against the sin of Adultery.

And Horace assisted it in its attempt; but they did not try to restrain harlotry (see 1 Sat. i. 3); even in the third and fourth Books of his Odes, which breathe forth a noble spirit of indignation against the sin of Adultery, and in favour of the Augustan legislation for checking it, are intermingled some poems which dally with the sin of Harlotry, and even with a blacker crime.

One of the strongest proofs of the divine origin of Christianity is to be found in the bold and uncompromising attitude which it at once assumed against both those vices.

Augustus and Horace smiled upon them with complacency; but Christianity denounced them with indignation, and it did more than this; by revealing the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God consecrating human nature, in body and soul, by uniting it in His own Person to the Nature of God, and by preaching the mystical union of Christ and His Church, and the sanctification of the body and soul of every member of the Church by means of that Union, and by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and by proclaiming the future Resurrection of the Body, to be glorified for ever hereafter in heaven, if kept in temperance, soberness, and chastity here on earth; it has in will and design, and also (wherever it is believed and obeyed), in practical effect, banished Harlotry and all Impurity from the world, and has rescued Mankind from their deadly consequences to persons, families, and society, and has imparted such peace and health and joy to households and to nations, as no earthly power of Princes, Potentates, and Parliaments, and as no earthly genius of Poets, Philosophers, Patriots, and Philanthropists have ever been able to confer.

What England *may become* socially and domestically (to say nothing of another, future, eternal life), without the teaching of definite Christian doctrine in her schools, may be learnt from the study of the writings of Horace—and after him, of Martial and Juvenal. May she not reproduce the dark picture, drawn by St. Paul (Rom. i. 22—32), of ancient Rome, and of the heathen World?

ETHICA ET SPIRITUALIA.

THE following Latin Apophthegms, collected or composed by the Bishop of Lincoln, were designed specially for the use of students in training for Holy Orders. An English translation of them will be found below, page 53.

ETHICA ET SPIRITUALIA, IN USUM ALUMNORUM SEMINARII THEOLOGICI PARTIM COLLEGIT, PARTIM CONSCRIPSIT CHRISTOPHORUS WORDSWORTH, EPISCOPUS LINCOLNIENSIS.

CHRISTOPHORUS divinâ permissione Episcopus Lincolniensis dilectis in Christo filiis, Theologici Seminarii alumnis, salutem, gratiam, et benedictionem.

Damus vobis in manus, adolescentes ingenui, libellum mole exiguum, sed, ni spes nos fallat, vobis non injucundum futurum neque infructuosum. Etenim in hoc tenui volumine tanquam in diversorio hospitali et spirituali convivio commorantes habebitis vobiscum et familiariter colloquentes viros ingenio et doctrinâ illustres, eosque pietate et sanctitate venerabiles. Convenietis Ignatium, Irenæum, Chrysostomum. Audietis Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Augustinum. Quorum ex consortio non exclusimus scriptores quosdam ethnicos, præsertim poetas, qui quasi prophetæ universæ humanitatis non injuriâ possunt appellari, et qui effatis suis luculenter declarant, Deum Optimum, Maximum Se nunquam *ἀμάρτυρον* reliquisse.[1]

Quædam de nostro interspersimus, in quibus sententias memorabiles versibus heroicis et elegiacis, item senariis iambis et choliambis concludere conati sumus, quò facilius legentium mentibus imprimerentur, ita ut non tam de styli elegantiâ laboraremus, vel metricam numerositatem affectaremus, quàm verborum brevitatem consequeremur.

Viris illustribus in usu fuisse accepimus, ut quæ sapienter, scitè, acutè, pressè et nervosè dicta audivissent, ea in unum quasi spicilegium connecterent, ita ut in promptu identidem haberent, siquando vel animus affectuum perturbatione agitaretur, vel de consilio capiendo, in re ancipiti, hæsitaret, vel præ socordiâ languesceret, et quasi calcari indigeret. Nam, ut ait ille,

ψυχῆς νοσούσης εἰσὶν ἰατροὶ λόγοι,

et,

> Sunt verba et voces, quibus hunc lenire dolorem
> Possis, et magnam morbi deponere partem;[2]

et, ut de animi obtorpescentis stimulis loquamur, ad excutiendum veternum salutaria sunt etiam mordacia conviciantis dicteria,

---

[1] Act. Apost. xiv. 17.

[2] Horat., 1 Epist. i. 34.

τοῖς σώφροσιν γὰρ ἀντίκεντρα γίγνεται.[3]

Sed instar omnium regis Hebræorum sapientissimi oraculum divinitus inspiratum audiamus: "Verba sapientum sunt stimuli, et quasi clavi in altum defixi, quæ per Magistrorum consilia data sunt a PASTORE UNO."[4] Nobis, adolescentes optimi, UNUS est PASTOR, Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, ex Cujus manibus per Magistros Sapientiæ,—Ecclesiæ Christianæ Doctores,—stimulos accepimus, nos ad fortiter et amanter agendum provocantes; et a Quo clavos quoque habemus in altum defixos, ad fidem nostram, inter omnes mundi procellas inconcussam, firmiter roborandam et solidandam. Ille est "Lux Mundi"[5] "quæ[6] illuminat omnem hominem venientem in mundum;" et quæcunque sapienter excogitata et pulchrè dicta a quolibet mortalium accepimus, nostrâ quidem sententiâ, sunt quasi scintillæ ex illâ Luce ineffabili coruscantes. Neque enim Ethnicos proscribimus tanquam ex illâ divinâ societate exules penitus atque extorres. Imò verò potius Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ Theologis aures applicemus, qui affirmare non dubitaverunt omnes sapientiæ rivulos, ubicunque scaturientes, ex sempiterno *τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ ἀϊδίου* fonte profluxisse.

Valete, dilecti in Domino. Dabamus feriâ secundâ post Pascha A.S. MDCCCLXXVII.

ETHICA ET SPIRITUALIA.

Σὺν Θεῷ.

LORD, be Thy Word my rule,
Therein may I rejoice;
Thy Glory be my aim,
Thy holy Will my choice;

Thy promises my hope,
Thy Providence my guard,
Thine arm my strong support,
Thyself my sure reward.

Via est DEI lex; Meta gloria est DEI.

DEO est Natura, quod fecerit.

Naturæ Conditor nihil in miraculis contra naturam fecit, sed tantum contra illam consuetudinem quæ nobis innotuit.

Miraculum esset omnibus miraculis incredibilius, si mundus sine miraculis Christo credidisset.

Omni miraculo, quod fit per hominem, majus miraculum est homo.

Nisi Deus esset immutabilis, nulla mutabilis natura permaneret.

Tempus a creatura cœpit, utrumque a Deo. Nihil in tempore novum est Deo, Qui condidit tempora, et ab æternitate existens omnia suis quæque temporibus distribuit.

---

[3] Æschyl. Eumen. 130.
[4] Eccl. xii. 11.
[5] Joh. ix. 5.
[6] Joh. i. 9.

Nihil in hoc mundo fieri potest, nisi vel faciente vel permittente Deo.

Peccatum non est natura, sed vitium naturæ.

Cum legitur SCRIPTURA, DEUM tibi cerne loquentem:
Tu, quoties oras, ipse Deo loqueris.

Naturæ liber est unus; Scriptura secundus;
Altera *posse* docens, altera *velle* Dei.

Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.
Umbra in Lege; imago in Evangelio; veritas in Cœlo. (*S. Ambros.*)

Οἱ προφῆται κατὰ Χριστὸν ἔζησαν. (*S. Ignat.*)

Hebræorum Patriarcharum Vita fuit prophetia. (*S. Aug.*)

Quod Vetus Testamentum non intelligatur a Judæis, non minuit ejus auctoritatem, imò auget; nam in ipso Vetere Testamento Judæorum cæcitas clarè prædicitur.

Sol facit ut solem videas; Deus facit ut videas Deum.

Qui dedit Legem, dedit Gratiam; Legem per Servum (Moysen) misit; IPSE cum gratiâ in mundum a cœlo descendit.

Lex data est ut Gratia quæreretur; Gratia data est ut Lex impleretur.

Omnia ferè in Sacra Scriptura vel de CHRISTO dicta sunt, vel propter EUM.

Quicquid dubitationis habet homo in animo auditis Scripturis, a CHRISTO non recedat; cum ei fuerit in illis Scripturæ verbis Christus revelatus, intelligat se intellexisse. Finis Legis Christus.

Stellas non extinguit nox; sic mentes fidelium adhærentes firmamento Scripturarum non extinguit mundi infidelitas.

Quæ in Verbo Dei nobis videntur contradictiones, conciliabit Deus, ut fideles confirmet; sunt quasi nodi in quercu, qui eam corroborant; sunt quasi nodi in reti, qui id constringunt.

He that hath God's Word, can hear His Silence.

Scriptura crescit cum parvulis. In campo Scripturarum exercemur obscuris, pascimur apertis. Sint, Deus, castæ deliciæ meæ Scripturæ Tuæ; neque fallar in eis, nec fallam ex eis.

Scriptura altitudine superbos irridet; profunditate attentos terret, veritate magnos pascit, affabilitate parvos nutrit.

Inhærendum est Scripturis, quæ apertæ sunt, ut ex eis revelentur quæ obscura sunt.

Deus Judæos dispersit, ut Scriptura in omnibus gentibus testes haberet.

Judæi Vetus Testamentum portantes in manibus, sed illud non intelligentes, servi sunt Christianorum, et quasi scriniarii et bajuli.

Stultus est qui non credit paucis in Scripturâ quæ restant complenda, qui tanta in Scripturâ prædicta videt jam completa.

Venturus Patres, visus nos salvat, Iësus ;
Tempora mutantur, non variata fides.

Christi sponsa anima est vinclo sociata fideli.

Nobis curiositate non opus est post Christum.

Virginitas animæ est intemerata fides.

Βούλει θεολόγος γίνεσθαι ; τὰς ἐντολὰς φύλασσε· πρᾶξις ἐπίβασις θεωρίας. (*S. Greg. Naz.*)

Lac Dei cum gypso non est miscendum.

Ut credas, operare ; fides merces operanti est.

Fides viam recludit intellectui ;
Sed mentis oculos claudit infidelitas.

Sicut palato est pœna non sano cibus,
Haud secus iniquis displicet Verbum Dei.
Sapit Dei mel cui palatum dat fides.

Fides Catholica crevit et claruit oppositionibus hæreticorum.

Ex Leonis prostrati cadavere mel fidem pascit. (Jud. xiv. 8, 9.)

Quomodo Christum Caput habere potest, qui Ejus Corpus dividit, quæ est Ecclesia ?

Quanta schismatis noxa est, quam (testibus Ignatio et Cypriano) martyrii sanguis non eluit !

O hæresis, O schisma, crudelis meretrix, erubesce judicari a Salomone (1 Regg. iii. 16—28) : mater non permisit dividi filium suum, tu dividis Dominum tuum !

Inter hæreticos laicis sacerdotalia munia injungunt. Schisma est unitas illis.

Quod apud multos a principio unum invenitur, non est erratum sed traditum. Id verum quod prius traditum ; id falsum quod posterius immissum.

Id verius quod prius, id prius quod ab initio.

Impensum precibus tempus pretiosius auro est ;
Durat mille annos hora dicata Deo.

Ora, ore, corde, vitâ.

Volens in templo orare, in te ora ; ita age ut templum Dei sis.

In procellis mundi, ad placidum litus Orationis ancorâ fidei constringe te.

Non vocis est, sed cordis, auditor Deus.

Corde tuo vigila, mundique exclude tumultum,
Oranti ut pateat cœlica porta tibi.

Etiam plorare quod non bene oras, orare est.

Temet siste Deo coram, et venerare silenter;
Præsentem totâ conspice mente Deum.

Non prohibet Deus rectè fieri *coram hominibus*, vel orando vel eleemosynas faciendo; sed *sic* fieri, ut *videamur* ab hominibus. Orans *coram hominibus* "intra in cubiculum *cordis* tui;" cùm eleemosynas facis *coram hominibus*, "ne sciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua." Quicquid facis coram hominibus, fac non hominibus sed Deo. Turba hominum sit tibi solitudo cum Deo.

Intentio cordis clamor ad Deum.
Our thoughts are heard in heaven.

Si clamas ad Deum, clama intus, ubi Deus audit.

Ita fabulantur Christiani, ut qui sciant Deum audire. (*Tertullian.*)

Qui Deum tantummodo asserit Christum, medicinam negat quâ sanatus est; qui hominem tantummodo asserit Christum, potentiam negat quâ creatus est.

Ego et Pater *unum sumus*, ait Christus (Joh. x. 30). Per "*unum*" Arium stravit, per "*sumus*" Sabellium.

In effundendo Spiritu Sancto utraque Christi natura monstrata est; spiravit ut homo; dedit Deum Deus.

Crux Christi transiit a loco suppliciorum ad frontes et diademata Imperatorum; si tantus honos *pœnæ* Christi, quantus erit *gloriæ?*

Christus pro nobis suscepit indebitam mortem, ut nos per Eum haberemus indebitam vitam.

In primo homine (qui fuit Adam) monstratum est, quid liberum arbitrium valeret ad mortem; in secundo Homine (qui est Christus) monstratum est quid gratia valeret ad vitam.

Totum genus humanum sunt quodammodo duo homines, Adam et Christus; primus homo et Secundus; Mors et Vita.

Quod Deo minus est, Deus non est.

Deus est homo factus; quid futurus est homo,
Quem propter Ipse factus est homo Deus?

Erubescat homo esse superbus, propter quem humilis factus est Deus.

Per superbiam lapsus est homo; humilitatem Deus adhibuit, ut hominem exaltaret.

Magna miseria homo superbus; maxima misericordia Deus humilis.

Christus orat pro nobis ut Sacerdos noster; orat in nobis ut Caput nostrum; oratur a nobis ut Deus noster.

Nemo erigit quidquam ad id in quo ipse est, nisi aliquantum ad id, in quo illud est, descendit. Hinc Deus homo factus est.

Impium te quæsivit Christus ut redimeret; inventum te et redemptum anne deseret?

Qualem te faciet Christus Suis divitiis, qui te divitem fecit Suâ paupertate?

Credidit latro Christo in cruce pendenti, et in Paradisum translatus est; quid fiet de illis qui contemnunt Christum in cœlo regnantem?

Deus operatur semper, et quietus est.
Deus sapienter utitur malis benè,
Atqui Diabolus utitur bonis malè;
Virus Diabolus melle conficit Dei.

Quæ mundus acta negligit, notat Deus;
Quæ mundus acta laudat, ignorat Deus.
Vilescat omne, quicquid est præter Deum.

Si requiem quæris, quære placere Deo.

In corde totus Ille figatur tuo,
Qui propter est te CHRISTUS affixus cruci.

Ὁ Ἔρως ὁ ἐμὸς ἐσταύρωται.

Attende triduum Christi crucifixi, sepulti et suscitati, et in te ipso Christum repræsenta.

Fecerunt civitates duas duo amores, amor sui terrenam, amor Dei cœlestem.

Solus se novit diligere, qui diligit Deum. Amor est vehiculum quo portamur ad patriam. Interroget se quisque quid amet, et inveniet utrius civitatis sit civis.

Quales amores,
Tales mores.

Deo placebit ille cui placet Deus;
Sibi placentes displicebunt Deo.

Sanctus sanctè sancta tractat.

Vive, precor, sed vive Deo; nam vivere mundo
Mortis opus; viva est vivere vita Deo.

Hoc sit amare, Deum propter amare Deum.

Solus se amat, qui nihil Deo præponit vel æquat.

Unde alii sunt aliis sanctiores, nisi abundantius habendo inhabitatorem Deum ?

Oderunt peccare boni Virtutis amore ;
Tu nihil admittes in te formidine pœnæ ?

Si bene vivere volumus, plus amemus quod promittit Deus, quàm quod promittit hic mundus ; et plus timeamus quod minatur Deus, quàm quod minatur mundus.

Deum nôsse, est vivere ; Deum nescire, mori.

Deo servire, regnare est ; Deo non obedire, servum esse Diaboli.

Quid prodest omnes rerum cognoscere causas,
Si facienda fugis, vel fugienda facis ?

Philosophi sine Deo non sunt periti, sed perituri.

Hoc est nescire, sine Christo plurima scire ;
Si Christum bene scis, satis est si plurima nescis.

Non ex personis probamus fidem, sed ex fide personas.

Tu mihi carcerem minaris, Ille Gehennam.

Sanctos per pravos Deus erudit atque coronat.

Non sunt bona opera nisi quæ per fidem et caritatem fiunt.

Faith the root ; Hope the flower ; Love the fruit.

Beata vita nisi amatur, non habetur.

Deus, finis nostrorum desideriorum, sine fine videbitur, sine fastidio amabitur, sine fatigatione laudabitur. Ecce quid erit finis sine fine.

Eruditio absque dilectione inflat, dilectio absque eruditione errat.

Somnus est animi, oblivisci Deum.

Deum quærens, gaudium quærit ; sic quæras, ut non in te sed in Deo quæras. Rectum est cor apud Deum, quùm Deus quæritur propter Deum.

In tantum videbimus Deum, in quantum Ei sumus similes.

A Te jubente posse meum venit, Deus.
Quod Tu jubes, da posse, dein quod vis jube.
Deus jubendo, quod jubet, facit utile.

Verbum Dei jubentis potestas fit hominis audientis.

Vita, Christe, quam egisti,
Vivat sub corde meo,
Vita, quam mihi dedisti,
Cela tecum in Deo.

Omne præceptum Dei leve est amanti; ut alæ volucri non sarcina sunt, sed vehiculum.

Nolentem prævenit Gratia, ut velis; volentem sequitur Gratia, ne frustra velis.

Quum præmiatur Deus facta tua, coronat Deus munera Sua.

Quodcumque tu bene feceris, argumentum est quid debeas Deo.

Nulla facis bona tu, nisi quæ facit ut facias tu.

Nil est vis humana, Dei si gratia desit:
Quæ rectè fiunt, Ille facit facere.

Ipsa oratio inter munera gratiæ deputatur. *Gratia* vocatur quia *gratis datur.*

Quid mihi sum sine Te, Deus meus, nisi dux in præceps?

God's Grace is man's Teacher.

Eget Gratiâ Ratio, utitur Gratia Ratione.

Deus vult humanam voluntatem esse liberam.

Si volumus defendere liberum arbitrium, ne oppugnemus Gratiam, per quam Voluntas humana bene utitur libertate.

Si non est gratia Dei, quomodo Deus salvat mundum? Si non est liberum arbitrium, quomodo Deus judicat mundum?

Homo memoriâ suâ non *cogit* facta quorum reminiscitur; sic Deus præscientiâ Suâ non *cogit* facienda quæ prævidet.

God *foresees* all things, but *forces* nothing.

Justi de perseverantiæ præmio certi sunt, sed de perseverantiâ *suâ* sunt incerti.

In gemmis pectoralis sacerdotalis posuit Deus *Urim* et *Thummim* (hoc est *illuminationes* et *perfectiones*); in Scripturis Sacris et Sacramentis infudit gratiam, ut illuminemur et perficiamur.

In gemmas Ecclesiæ Suæ, hoc est, in animas sanctas, inspiravit gratiam, ut gemmæ fiant et splendeant in cœlesti Hierusalem in sempiternum.

Dormit Adam in Paradiso, et ex latere dormientis fit Eva, sponsa experrecti; dormit CHRISTUS in cruce, et ex latere fluunt sacramenta, per quæ nascitur et vivit ECCLESIA, sponsa resurgentis de mortuis et in cœlo regnantis. Percussit lanceâ latus Christi persecutor, et fudit pretium Redemptor. Christi Sacramenta, quæ a latere percussi profluxerunt, per Christi sacrificium fidelibus applicantur in vitam æternam.

Sacramenta non salvant infidelem, sed Deus salvat fideles per sacramenta.

Si modo Christus adest nobis, et aranea muro est;
Sed si Christus abest, vel murus aranea fiet.

Man's Midnight is God's Noon.

Ut Moysis facies, *aliis* tua fama nitescat,
Sed ne fac speculum, quod tueare, tibi.

Laudari metuas mundi popularibus auris,
Ne tu judicio dejiciare Dei.

Cum tu laudaris, temet contemne; sed a te
Laudetur per te Qui cuncta operatur, et in te;
Redde Deo laudem, ne condemneris ab Illo.

Ne laudibus tuis læteris propter te laudatum, sed læteris propter Dei gloriam, et utilitatem proximi tui.

Ne jactes tua facta: Deus sua dona coronat;
Si merita enumeras, quid nisi dona Dei?

Malis displicere, magna laus est.

Pastor qui lupos laudat, odit oves.

Quanto quisque minus mundi venatur honores,
Tanto cuique dabit præmia plura Deus.

Væ homini cui auriga superbia est!
Si Phaëton es tu, te manet Eridanus.

Sequitur superbos ultor a tergo Deus.

Privatio gratiæ est argumentum superbiæ.

Simulatio humilitatis est apex superbiæ.

Gratia, a Deo infusa, *concavo* humilitatis recipitur, *convexo* superbiæ expellitur.

Scire tuum nihil est, nisi te scire hoc sciat alter?

On travaille trop pour la gazette.

Apostolus Paulus erat omnibus superior, quia optabat omnes sibi esse æquales.

Superbiâ cecidit Diabolus, humilitate exaltatus est Christus.

Non ascenditur nisi per humilitatem.

Superbia odit consortium, et sola cupit eminere.

Be seen to do good; but do not do good to be seen.

Ut videare bonus, cura sit esse bonus.

Homines laudant te, et nil sciunt; Deus scit omnia, et tacet.

Qui sese attollit, magnâ cadet ille ruinâ,
Contra qui sese deprimit, altus erit.

In rectè factis vitanda superbia; nam qui
In rectè factis tollitur, ille cadit.

Quid prodest dare divitias pauperi, si superbior fis dando, quàm fueras possidendo?

Quid prodest, tenuari corpus abstinentiâ, si intumescat animus superbiâ?

Quid prodest vinum non bibere, et odio inebriari?

Quid prodest, pallere jejunio, et livere invidiâ?

Meliores et sanctiores sunt conjugati humiles quàm superbientes virgines.

Magna felicitas a felicitate non vinci.

Malam conscientiam non sanat encomium laudantis; bonam conscientiam non lædit opprobrium conviciantis.

Hic murus aheneus esto,
Nil conscire sibi, nullâ pallescere culpâ.

Nulla pœna, quanta pœna!

Sibi superbus qui placet, stulto placet.

Quid magis est miserum misero haud miserante seipsum?

Non magna loquimur, sed vivimus.

Ἀμεινον σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντα μὴ εἶναι.

Sperne voluptates; nocet empta dolore voluptas.

Sincerum est nisi vas, quodcunque infundis acescit.

Spiritûs templum, Dominique membrum
Est tuum corpus; simile et resurget
Corpori Christi, modo castitate
Sanctificetur.

Mortificatio carnis est glorificatio spiritûs.

Christi semper præcursor est Johannes Baptista, et præparat viam Ei.

Non est emendum gaudium volaticum
Unius horæ vel brevis dieculæ
Magno dolore mentis atque corporis.

Quomodo a cœno potes ascendere ad cœlum?

Fastidire voluptatem, quam magna voluptas!
Est virtus, licitis abstinuisse bonis.

Mortifica corpus, carnem crucifige rebellem:
Sic dabitur capiti pulcra corona tuo.

Amor rerum terrenarum viscum est alarum spiritualium.

Cogitemus crucem, et divitias lutum putabimus.

Vanis carere est suave suavitatibus.

Corporis ærumnas patior, mentisque dolores,
Dulcibus ut vitiis abstinuisse velim;
Ast ego quid valeo? nil, si Tua gratia desit:
Oh! miserere mei Tu, Deus, et fer opem.

Sobrietas purget quod supra sidera surget
Corpus, et est ædes, quâ, Deus alme, sedes.

Summum crede nefas animam præferre pudori,
Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.

Si coram hominibus confiteberis Christum,
Coram angelis te confitebitur Christus;
Sed si negabis, tu negaberis Christo.

Christi pudet te? pudeat ut tui Christum!

Qui laudari vult ab hominibus, Christo vituperante, non defendetur ab hominibus, Christo judicante.

Ἐγγὺς μαχαίρας ἐγγὺς ἕστηκας θεοῦ,
Θεοῦ μεταξὺ, καὶ μεταξὺ θηρίων.

Crus in nervo, cor in cœlo.

Vox martyrum, "Erue me a *timore* inimici."

Uva calcatur, vinum exprimitur.

Rubus in eremo, consummaris, non consumeris.

"Lilium inter spinas" (Cant. ii. 2) sancta Ecclesia, sponsa Christi. "Lilium inter spinas" sancta omnis anima sponsa Christi.

Gemo in re,
Gaudeo in spe.

Gemis in areâ,
Gaudebis in horreo.

Ex oleâ liquidum contusâ manat olivum.

Vita stabulum; mansio cœlum.

Herba metitur, et fit fœnum odorum.

Ignem palea timeat;
Auro quid faciet?

Mittitur vas in fornacem ut coquatur, non ut frangatur.

Afflictiones flores sunt, quibus nectitur tua corona cœlestis.

Non est ad astra mollis a terris via.

Chi bene mal non può soffrir,
A grand' onore non può venir.

Bona facere et mala pati, regium est, imò divinum.

Sol, nisi cum deficit, spectatorem non habet.

Grana manent: vento paleæ rapiuntur inanes.

Qualis sit cujusque fides, tribulatio probat.

Mercenarios a pastoribus persecutio discernit.

Τὸ ζῆν ὁ Χριστός ἐστι, καὶ κέρδος θανεῖν.
Christus mihi sit vivere, et mori lucrum.

Lympha, crucis ligno injecto, dulcescit amara. (Exod. xv. 25.)

Naufragium metuens dextrâ crucis arripe lignum.

Crux schola Christiani. Crux scala cœli. Crux, Lux, Dux, Lex, Rex.

Eris liber, si fueris servus, liber peccatis, servus Christi: servitus Diaboli pessima servitus; servitus Christi, unica libertas.

Voluntas libera tanto liberior quanto sanior; et tanto sanior, quanto divinæ voluntati subjectior.

Liberum arbitrium divinæ gratiæ donum est.

Voluntas quomodo dici potest esse libera, si vincentibus et vincientibus cupiditatibus sit subdita?

Libertas vocatur nonnullis, potestas aliis et sibi nocendi.

Te committe Deo securus, et omnia perfer;
Non plus tentabit quàm tolerare dabit.

Exemplo Suo docuit Christus quid non timeres et quid sperares. Mortem timebas—mortuus est Christus; de resurrectione desperabas—resurrexit Christus; pro te mortuus est et resurrexit Christus in eo corpore quod accepit a te.

Suaviter natat, cujus Deus sustinet mentum.

Non littus ultra sæviunt fluctus maris.

When the shore is won at last,
Who will count the billows past?

Patimur adversa, ne viator, tendens ad patriam, stabulum pro domo diligat.

Μὴ βλέπε τὰ ἴδια, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀΐδια.

Μηδ' ὕπνον μαλακοῖσιν ἐπ' ὄμμασι προσδέξασθαι,
Πρὶν τῶν ἡμερινῶν ἔργων τρὶς ἕκαστον ἐπελθεῖν,
"Πῇ παρέβην; τί δ' ἔρεξα; τί μοι δέον οὐκ ἐτελέσθη;"

Χαλεπὰ τὰ καλά.

Labor omnia vincit
Improbus.

Nil sine magno
Vita labore dedit mortalibus.

Τῶν πόνων πωλοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάντα τἀγάθ' οἱ θεοί.

Omnis vita tentatio est.

Detrectans curam Virtutem deseris ipsam.

Quanto plus rem communem curas quàm propriam, tanto amplius te profecisse scias.

Privatus illis census erat brevis ;
Commune magnum.

Φρενῶν ῥανίς μοι μᾶλλον, ἢ βυθὸς τύχης. (*S. Greg. Naz.*)

Πλέων κόπος,
Πλέον κέρδος.

More pain
More gain.

Si vocat officium, propera parere vocanti,
Et quanto minus ire voles, magis ire memento.

Making your hardest task your best delight.

Ex atrâ veniunt clarissima fulgura nube,
Aurum de rutilo clarius igne micat.

Torquens membra lues animo dat sæpe salutem ;
Cædendo sanat vivificatque Deus.

Merses profundo, pulcrior evenit.

Quod dubitas, ne feceris.

Ne facere id dubites quod certo scis faciendum ;
Ne fac quod dubitas an liceat facere.

Ea quæ constat esse peccata nullo bonæ causæ obtentu facienda sunt.

Him, only him, the hand of God defends
Whose *means* are fair and spotless as his *ends*.

Φιλοτιμεῖσθε ἡσυχάζειν, καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια.

Parum est abstinere a malo, nisi fiat bonum ; parum est nemini nocere, nisi studeas prodesse quam plurimis.

Σπάρτην ἔλαχες· ταύτην κόσμει·
Τὰς δὲ Μυκήνας ἡμεῖς ἰδίᾳ.

Ut quæ necesse sunt agas, ea tantum agas.

Remember needless things to shun,
That needful may by thee be done.

Μὴ ἀλλοτριοεπισκόπει.

Duos lepores qui sequitur, is neutrum capit.

Nemo sic debet esse otiosus ut utilitatem negligat proximi; nec sic negotiosus, ut contemplationem deserat Dei.

Quærit otium sanctum amor Veritatis; suscipit negotium justum necessitas Caritatis.

Est temporalis utilis confusio;
Confunde nunc te pœnitentiâ volens,
Ne te perenni morte confundat Deus,
Et sempiterna destruat confusio.

Si te perturbas, non perturbaberis Illo.

Τοὺς καιροὺς καταμάνθανε, Τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα.

Τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοράζου.

—— Turning the dust
Of servile opportunity to gold.

Qui sunt inimici Ecclesiæ? Pagani, Mohammedani, Judæi. Qui sunt inimiciores? Mali Christiani. Qui sunt inimicissimi? Mali sacerdotes.

Tu qui Christi sacerdos es, audi vocem Magistri.

Bonus pastor non sua quærere debet, sed impendere.

Lectione, oratione, meditatione pectus tuum sit templum Dei.

Ut sis concha, prius tu debes esse canalis;
Non prius effundes quàm lymphâ largus abundes.

Præsis ut prosis.

Manus tua sit ad clavum, oculus ad cœlum.

Non proficere, est deficere.

Ἐπισκοπῶν πούμαινε ποιμνίον θεοῦ·
Ἄγειρ', ὁδήγει, νύσσε ῥαβδούχῳ χερί·
Καὶ στέφανον ἕξεις Ἀρχιποίμενος πάρα.

Error magistri tentatio populi. (*Vinc. Lerin.*)

The Teacher's error is the people's trial; and so much the greater trial, the greater the Teacher is. (*Hooker.*)

Qui erubescit doceri, non discet, qui irascitur discenti, non docebit.

Illius doctoris libenter audio vocem, qui non sibi plausum, sed mihi planctum, movet. Verus doctor placere studet rebus, non verbis; non servit verbis, sed verba serviunt illi. Prius precare, deinde prædica. Ante sis orator quàm dictor. Tutiùs auditur Veritas quàm prædicatur.

In prædicando ne dicas nova, sed novè.

Nisi ardeas quum prædicas, non accendes alios prædicando.

"Orate et arate."
"Novate novale."

Ignominia *sacerdotum* est, propriis studere divitiis. Divinas Scripturas sæpius lege, imò nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur; disce quod doceas; non confundant opera tua sermonem tuum, ne quis tibi respondeat, Cur quæ dicis ipse non facis? Lacrymæ auditorum laudes tuæ sint. Nolo te declamatorem esse, sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum Dei tui eruditissimum. Verba volvere et celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere, indoctorum hominum est. *Nec rusticus et simplex frater ideo se sanctum putet, si nihil noverit; nec peritus et eloquens æstimet linguâ sanctitatem.* Cogitemus crucem Christi, et divitias lutum esse putabimus. Cave ne linguam aut aures habeas prurientes; ne ipse aliis detrahas, aut alios audias detrahentes. Nemo invito auditori libenter refert. Sagitta in lapidem non figitur. Discat detractor non detrahere, dum te videt non libenter audire detrahentem. (*S. Hieron.*)

Auditor verbi debet esse similis mundis animalibus (Levit. xi. 3), quæ ruminant meditando, et unguem findunt securè ambulando.

Melius est dubitare de occultis quàm litigare de incertis.

In necessariis Unitas, in dubiis Libertas, in omnibus Caritas.

In *unâ fide* nihil officit Ecclesiæ *consuetudo* in ritibus et ceremoniis *diversa.* (*S. Greg. M.*)

Διαφωνία ἐθῶν (in ritibus Ecclesiarum diversarum) ὁμίνοιαν πίστεως συνίστησι. (*S. Iren.*)

Terreo quia timeo.

Qui sacerdotes non sunt, sacerdotalia ne affectent, utcunque eloquentiâ et ingenio clari. Qui sacerdotes sunt, ne contemnantur a grege suo, etsi eloquentiâ et ingenio non enitescant. Quid enim prodest clavis aurea, si aperire quod volumus non potest? quid obest clavis lignea, si potest?

Tentatur rebus patientia nostra molestis;
Vincit qui patitur; vincitur impatiens.

Non habet Dei Caritatem qui non amat Ecclesiæ Unitatem. Sacramenta possunt *esse* in schismate, sed non *prosunt* nisi in Ecclesiæ unitate, imò etiam *obsunt.*

Cum Caritate proderunt charismata,
Sed Caritas si desit, haud quidquam valet.

Egregia est virtus, mores tolerare malignos,
Pacificoque hostes pacis amare animo.

Melior est in malis factis humilis lamentatio, quàm in bonis factis superba gloriatio.

Perge viam sublimitatis pede humilitatis.

Qui phreneticum ligat, et qui lethargicum excitat, ambobus molestus, ambos amat.

Beatus qui amat amicum in Deo, et inimicum propter Deum.

Irasci hominis est; cessare ab ira, Christiani.

Laudabilius est leniter accipere corrigentem, quàm acriter corrigere deviantem.

Παίουσιν ἀδάμας, διστάζουσι μαγνῆτις.[1]

Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace,
To silence envious tongues; be just and fear not.

Magis monendo quàm minando proficis.

Ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ.
Veritas maxima Caritas.

Christus Se Veritatem appellavit, non Consuetudinem.

Vera Caritas vacua mercede non est, sed non est mercenaria.

Nil illum lædet qui suaviter utitur hoste,
Si rectè tractas, hostis amicus erit.

Quicunque famæ detrahit volens meæ,
Invitus addit ille mercedi meæ,
Si detrahentem caritate prosequor,
Pro detrahente supplicaturus Deum.

Ne mala redde malis; pro detrectantibus ora:
Fortia sunt animis mitibus arma preces.

Fortior est qui se, quàm qui fortissima vincit
Oppida; qui rex est, imperat ipse sibi.

Iram qui vincit, hostem vincit maximum.

Bis vincit, qui se vincit in victoriâ.

There will come a time, when three words uttered with charity and meekness will receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit. (*Richard Hooker.*)

---

[1] S. Greg. Naz. de S. Athanasio.

Νῆφε, ὡς θεοῦ ἀθλητής.
Στῆθι ἑδραῖος, ὡς ἄκμων τυπτόμενος.

Ne propter homines vitia diligas, neque
Homines vitiosos vitia propter oderis;
Errans ametur, ejus errores fuge;
Pacem cum hominibus, bellum cum vitiis, habe.

Ne ametis amicorum vitia, si amatis amicos.

Melius est cum severitate diligere, quàm sine veritate negligere.

Nemo potest verè amicus esse hominis, nisi priùs amicus fuerit Veritatis.

Non omne quod libet licet, nec omne quod licet expedit.

Omnia libera sunt per fidem, omnia serva per caritatem.

Caritas alios parturit, cum aliis infirmatur, ad alios se inclinat, ad alios se erigit, aliis severa, aliis blanda, omnibus serva, nullis inimica.

Melius est ut scandalum oriatur, quàm ut veritas deseratur.

Bonæ res neminem scandalizant nisi malam mentem.

Melius est ut pereat unus, quàm unitas.

De mundi spinis roseam tibi necte coronam;
Æternas gignit spinea virga rosas.

Nullus sanctorum in hac vitâ lacrymas non habet; imò quanto quisque sanctior est, tanto fit ejus in orando fletus uberior.

Molle rotas oleum accelerat; corrodit acetum.

Exercent acuuntque bonos mala; tu bonus esto;
Ne vincare malis, sed mala vince bono.

Martyrem facit non pœna, sed causa.

Facit coronas Mors catenas Martyrum.

Quid sibi plaudit inimicus meus? flagellum de eo facit Pater cœlestis meus ut me erudiat ad patriam meam sempiternam.

Mors est acquisita in Adam peccando, justitia in Christo impletur moriendo.

Mortuus est Christus, per mortem ut Mors moreretur.

Vive quotidie ut mox moriturus, si mori vis ut semper victurus.

Veritas in ore regnet; Caritas in pectore;
Castitasque Puritasque in ore, corde, corpore.

Persecutoribus solâ Caritate resistitur.

Injuria inimici non lædit te, sed lædit te odium tuum inimici tui; dilige inimicum tuum, et injuria inimici tui fiet beneficium tibi.

Magis te vastat ira tua irascendo, quàm inimicitia inimici tui inimicando.

Qui fraudes alii fabricat, sibi fabricat ipsi:
Subdolus insidiis fallitur ipse suis.

Οἳ αὐτῷ κακὰ τεύχει ἀνὴρ ἄλλῳ κακὰ τεύχων.

Malum consilium consultori est pessimum.

Nemo non priùs in se, quàm in alterum, peccat.

Ecclesiæ qui spargit, colligit sibi.

Amicus certus in re incertâ cernitur.

Qui suadet, sua det.

Bis dat, qui cito dat.

Da *omni* petenti; sed non *omnia* petenti.

Pars beneficî est, quod petitur si bellè neges.

Semina committis terræ; committere Christo
An dubitas, veras Qui tibi reddet opes?

Committis terræ, fructus et colligis amplos;
Committis Christo; num peritura times?

Caritas accrescit usu, largitate ditior.

Lucrum in loco negligere maximum est lucrum.

Damnum est vocandum cum malâ famâ lucrum.

Lucraris, faciens pietatis nomine sumptum. (*Tertullian.*)

Oratio sine eleemosynâ sterilis est et inefficax. (*S. Cyprian.*)

Tam deest avaro quod habet quàm quod non habet.

Desunt inopiæ multa, avaritiæ omnia.

Εἰ ΧΡΗΜΑΤ' ἐστὶν, ὠφελεῖ τὰ ΚΤΗΜΑΤΑ.

Prudens an optas esse mercator? Deo
Impende tempus, pauperi pecuniam.

Cum bonum facis, hilariter fac; si tristis facis, fit de te magis quàm facis.

Nemo invitus bene facit, etiam si bonum sit quod facit.

Φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄνευ γογγυσμῶν. Εὐμετάδοτοι, κοινωνικοί. Χρείαις ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες. Ἱλαρὸν δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός. Ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἱλαρότητι.

Imperat aut servit collecta pecunia cuique.

Non possidet, sed possidetur, qui sibi
Vult esse dives, atque pauper est Deo.

Non possidentem multa vocaveris
Rectè beatum; rectiùs occupat
Nomen beati, qui, &c.

Contracto meliùs parva cupidine
Vectigalia porrigam, &c.

Quas dederis, solas semper habebis opes.

Da, dum tempus habes; tibi propria sit manus hæres.
Auferet id nemo quod dabis ipse Deo.

Dives fidelis aurum arenam deputat.

Non plus habendo, at minus egendo, dives es.

Invidus alterius macrescit rebus opimis;
Invidiâ Siculi non invenere tyranni
Majus tormentum.

Ira furor brevis est; animum rege, qui nisi paret
Imperat.

Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito.

Aude, hospes, contemnere opes, et te quoque dignum
Finge Deo; rebusque veni non asper egenis.

Divitiæ grandes homini sunt vivere parcè
Æquo animo.

Regum æquabat opes animis.

Titulis et fascibus olim
Major habebatur donandi gloria.

Nemo læditur nisi a seipso.

Nemo malus felix.

Ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου.

Suaviter in modo,
Fortiter in re.

Dimidium facti qui cœpit habet. Sapere aude.

Actu severus, atque verbo serius,
Vultu serenus esto, tranquillus statu.

Ne facias aliis, quod tu fieri tibi non vis;
Atque aliis facito, quod tibi vis fieri.

Condemnans alios tu condemnaberis ipse;
Sed si condones, tibi condonabitur ipsi.

Tu servum alienum judicas, fratrem tuum?
Omnes tribunal ad Dei constabimus.

Iratus fratri placabis quomodo PATREM?

Detrahere et detrahenti auscultare, utrumque damnabile.

Ille est perfectus vir, qui non labitur ore,
Nec tacitus pravas avidâ bibit aure loquelas.

Παῦσαί με τοῖς ὡσὶ βλασφημῶν.

Quisquis amat dictis absentem rodere amicum,
Hanc mensam indignam noverit esse sibi.

Χαίροντι σύγχαιρ'· ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη.

Οὕτοι συνέχθειν, ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν.

Suus cuique attributus est error;
Sed non videmus manticæ quod in tergo est.

Ἀρεταῖσιν ἄλλου μὴ φθόνει, σύγχαιρε δέ·
Μισεῖς σεαυτὸν εἰ φθονεῖς, φιλῶν φιλεῖς.
Ἄλλους ὁ μισῶν αὐτὸν ἐχθαίρων στυγεῖ,
Ὁ δ' ἄλλον ἀγαπῶν αὐτὸς αὑτὸν ὠφελεῖ.
Σὺ μὴ τὰ σαυτοῦ, πλὴν τὰ θατέρου, σκόπει.

Ama bonam famam inimici tui.

Secretò amicos admone, lauda palam.

Qui fratris animam diligit, salvat suam;
Qui fratris animam negligit, perdit suam.

Vis invenire tu bonos? esto bonus.

Fides habeatur; obligat fides fidem.

Ne contemnaris, nullum contemnere debes.

Etiam capillus unus habet umbram suam.

Quid, de quoque viro, et cui dicas, sæpe videto.

Chi compra terra
Compra guerra.

Οἶκος φίλος οἶκος ἄριστος.

Alium silere quod voles, primus sile.

Τὰ πάντ' ἀλήθευ', ὀρθὸν ἀλήθει' ἀεί.

Magna est victoria, vince a veritate.

Loquendum est ut vulgus, sentiendum est ut sapientes.

Si vis currentem prendere, curre cito.

Freno indorato non migliora il cavallo.

Quid cæco cum speculo?

Acqua turbida non fa specchio.

Melius in viâ Veritatis claudicare, quàm præter viam fortiter ambulare.

Πᾶν πρᾶγμα ἔχει δύο λαβάς.

Εἷς ἀνὴρ οὐδεὶς ἀνήρ.

Τὰ καλὰ καλῶς γενέσθω.

Οὐκ ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ τὸ εὖ, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ εὖ τὸ μιγα.

Deliberandum est diu, quod statuendum est semel.

Bonum opus intentio facit, si intentionem fides dirigit per legem Dei ad gloriam Dei.

Non scribit, cujus carmina nemo legit.

Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes stupent.

Canes timidi vehementiùs latrant.

Vasa inania magniloquentiùs sonant.

Neu sis superbus extra viam, neu piger sis in viâ.

Qui nihil audet, nunquam gaudet.

Consilio melius vincas quàm iracundiâ.

Sapiens senescit, non segnescit.
Γηράσκει δ' αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος.

Lenior et melior fis accedente senectâ,
Ut vinum longo mitescit mollius usu?

Suavissima vita est, sentire indies se fieri meliorem.

Χρόνος πολυτελέστατον ἀνάλωμα.

Nulla nisi temporis honesta avaritia est.

Assuesce vivere cum Angelis, vivendo ut Angelus.

Noli sequi spiritum tuum, si vis habere Spiritum Dei.

Longum tibi videtur? est citum Deo;
Temet Deo subjunge; tunc fiet cito.

Multos peccare non pudet, quos agere pœnitentiam pudet.

De vulnere suo non erubescunt, sed de vulneris ligaturâ.

Principiis obsta; sero medicina paratur
Quum mala per longas invaluere moras.

Ne fluites dubiæ momento pendulus horæ;
Te committe Deo; satis est sua cura diei;
Μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀρκετὸν αὐτῆς
Ἡ κακία· πείθεσθε θεῷ, καὶ στέργετε πάντα.

Μὴ μεμψίμοιρος ἴσθι, γογγυσμῶν δ' ἄτερ
Κἀν πᾶσι χαίρων εὐχαριστίας δίδου.

Τυρβάζει περὶ πολλά· μόνου δ' ἑνός ἐστιν ἀνάγκη.
Μηδὲν μεριμνῶν πάντα τῷ θεῷ μέθες.

Corporis occisor non est metuendus; at Ille
Qui mandare potest corpusque animamque Gehennæ.

Mala mors non est vocanda, quam bona vita præcesserit.

Non potest malè mori, qui benè vixerit.

Qualis vita,
Finis ita.

Æstus est sæculi, sed umbra magna sub alis Dei.

Diabolus tantum nos tentare permittitur, quantum expedit proficientibus.

Dicimus autem
Hos quoque felices, qui ferre incommoda vitæ
Nec jactare jugum vitâ didicere magistrâ.

Δεινὸς ὃς θεὸν σέβει. Sapiens dominabitur astris. Bonus si servit, regnat; malus si regnat, servit.

Laudandi sunt, qui nolunt cum mundo florente florere, et cum mundo pereunte perire.

Quantis laboribus in tempore fatigant se homines, ut in æternum sint infelicissimi!

Si divitiæ a nobis diliguntur, ibi acerventur ubi nunquam peribunt, hoc est, in cœlo; si honor, quæratur ibi ubi nemo erit malignus; si salus diligitur, ibi desideretur ubi nemo languescet, nemo morietur, sed omnes vivent in æternum.

Felicitas quem nulla corrumpit placens,
Furore nulla franget infelicitas.

Omnes Virtutes Amore consummantur.

Temperantia est Amor, Deo se integrum incorruptumque servans; Fortitudo est Amor, omnia propter Deum facilè perferens; Justitia est Amor, Deo serviens, et ob hoc bene imperans cæteris, quæ homini subjecta sunt; Prudentia est Amor, bene discernens ea quibus adjuvetur ad Deum ab iis quibus impediri potest a Deo. (*S. Aug.*)

Si sursum est cor, sicci sunt oculi.

Στενὴ ἡ πύλη, οὐχ ἡ πόλις.
Via longa et arcta; sed urbs ampla.

Per angusta itur ad augusta.

Angustus callis spatiosam ducit ad urbem.

Via, angusta laboranti, fit ampla amanti.

Amas habere quod Christus? ne time pati quod Christus passus est. "Ego sum Via, Veritas, Vita," ait Christus; Via est, quâ itur; Veritas, ad quam pervenitur; Vita, in quâ manetur.

Felix est, non qui habet quod amat, sed qui amat quod amandum est, et quod semper est habiturus.

In quâ peregrinus ambulas mundi viâ,
Hoc, quòd perennem ad patriam ducit, placet.

Vitæ nostræ principium mortis quoque est exordium.

The Martyr's Deathday is his Birthday.

Καλόν μοι τὸ δῦναι ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα εἰς θεὸν ἀνατείλω.

Claudere oculos mundo, et aperire Christo.

Fratres nostros, qui in Christo decesserunt, non amisimus, sed præmisimus.

Oh utinam possim pennis volitare columbæ,
Ocius ut nidum labar ad ætherium!

Deargentemus pennas nostras in conversatione Christi. (*S. Bernard*)

Ζωὴν σὺ τὴν σὴν μὴ φίλει, μηδὲ στύγει·
Εὖ ζῇν, ὅσον ζῇς, τὸ δὲ πόσον θεῷ μέθες.

Γνῶθι σεαυτόν.
Γνῶθι καιρόν.
Μηδὲν ἄγαν.
Μέτρον ἄριστον.
Μελέτη τὸ πᾶν.

Τί βίος ; μελέτη θανάτου.

O quam miserum, nescire mori!

In hoc mundo fructuosè dicamus, "*Omnia transeunt,*" ne postea infructuosè dicamus, "*Omnia transierunt*"!

In navigatione vitæ tuæ, ne naves tecum navigantes contempleris, sed astra super te splendentia, et navim tuam dirigentia ad portum æternum.

Illi mors gravis occubat,
Qui notus nimis omnibus
Ignotus moritur sibi. (*Seneca.*)

Vive memor leti; fugit hora; hoc quod loquor inde est.

Quid diu, ubi finis?

Omne tempus pusillum est; quid enim tam exiguum, quàm quod festinat ut non sit?

Hæredi æternitatis Adam vixit heri.

Omne Tempus quàm breve est! Æternitas quàm longa!

Habitas in silentio Deus, solus, magnus; spargens pœnales cæcitates super illicitas cupiditates.

Væ tibi, flumen moris humani, volvens in mare formidolosum Evæ filios, quod vix transeunt qui Lignum Crucis conscenderint.

Naufragium fugis, et plumbum rerum terrenarum amplecteris! Accipe Crucis lignum, et natabis.

Civitatis cœlestis rex Veritas; lex Caritas, modus Æternitas.

Mors est ventura; ne fac quæ scis nocitura.

Our Millenniums hang on our Moments.

Horæ pereunt, et imputantur.

Deus quædam punit in hoc mundo, ne divina providentia non credatur; sed multa non punit in hoc mundo, ut futurum judicium semper expectetur.

Dies mortis tuæ et judicii æterni ignoratur a te, ut omnis dies vitæ tuæ observetur a te.

Qualis quisque moritur, talis judicabitur.

Respice finem.

Si rectè vivis, tibi mors quid obest morituro?

Omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum.

Sole oriente, tui reditûs a morte memento;
Sis memor occasûs, sole cadente, tui.

Meditate daily on the five last things; Death, Resurrection, Heaven, Hell, and Eternity.

Consider all things with regard to ETERNITY.

Τῷ Θεῷ δόξα.

SOLI DEO GLORIA.

TRANSLATION OF THE FOREGOING.

Many of the preceding Maxims are in Latin verse, and can hardly be translated adequately into English.

ETHICAL AND SPIRITUAL MAXIMS, PARTLY COLLECTED, PARTLY COMPOSED, BY THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN, FOR THE USE OF THE STUDENTS OF THE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, LINCOLN.

LORD, be Thy Word my rule,
Therein may I rejoice;
Thy Glory be my aim,
Thy holy Will my choice;

Thy Promises my hope,
Thy Providence my guard,
Thine Arm my strong support,
Thyself my sure reward.

The Law of God thy course; His Glory be thy goal.

Nature is to God that which He Himself has made.

The Author of Nature does nothing in miracles that is contrary to Nature, but only that is contrary to that course of things which is familiar to us.

It would have been a miracle more incredible than all miracles, if the World had believed in Christ without miracles.

Man is a greater miracle than any miracle which is done by means of man.

If God were not unchangeable, no changeable nature could subsist.

Time began with Creation, and both began from God. Nothing in time is new to God, Who, existing from Eternity, disposes all things in their proper season.

Nothing can take place in this world, without the act or permission of God.

Sin is not nature, but a corruption of nature.

When thou readest Scripture, behold God speaking to thee; and when thou prayest, remember that thou art speaking to God.

Scripture is one Book; Nature is another; the latter reveals the Power of God, the former, His Will.

The New Testament is concealed in the Old; the Old Testament is revealed in the New.

The shadow was in the Law; the image in the Gospel; the Truth is in heaven.

The Prophets lived a Christward life.

The Lives of the Hebrew Patriarchs were a Prophecy.

The fact, that the Old Testament is not understood by the Jews, does not invalidate its authority; nay, it enhances it; because the blindness of the Jews is clearly foretold in it.

The Sun is the cause of thy seeing the Sun; God is the cause of thy seeing Him.

God, who gave the Law, gave also Grace; He sent the Law by His Servant Moses; He Himself came down from heaven with Grace.

The Law was given, in order that Grace might be desired; Grace is given, that the Law may be fulfilled.

All things in Scripture are either about Christ, or for Christ.

Whatsoever doubts thou mayest have on hearing a passage of Scripture, do not depart from Christ, but consider thy doubt in reference to Him; and if He is revealed to thee in that passage, thou mayest understand that thou hast understood it aright.

Christ is the end of the Law.

Night does not put out the stars in the heavens; the Unbelief of the World does not put out the light of the mind, which clings to the heaven of Scripture.

The things in God's Word, which seem to be contradictions, will be reconciled by God, for the comfort of the faithful; they are like knots in an oak, which strengthen it; they are like knots in a net, which bind it together.

He that hath God's Word, can hear His Silence.

Scripture grows with Christ's little ones. In the field of Scripture, the obscure things exercise us, the clear things nourish us.

My God, may Thy Holy Scriptures be ever my pure delight! may I neither be deceived in them, nor deceive by them.

Scripture defies the proud by its height; it awes the diligent by its depth; it feeds the strong by its truth, and it nourishes the weak by its condescension.

We must cleave to the Scriptures which are clear, in order that by them we may understand the things which are dark.

God has scattered the Jews everywhere, in order that the Scripture may have them as its witnesses in all nations.

The Jews carry the Old Testament in their hands, but do not understand it in their hearts; they are, as it were, the servants, secretaries, and porters of the Christians, who prove the Gospel from it.

That man is a fool, who, when he sees so many prophecies in Scripture that have been fulfilled already, does not believe those other few prophecies in Scripture, which remain still to be fulfilled.

The Fathers were saved by Jesus Who was to come; we are saved by Him Who has come. The times are changed; but not the Faith.

The soul is a spouse of Christ, when joined to Him by the bond of faith.

Dost thou wish to become a divine? Keep the commandments. Obedience is the ladder of Contemplation.

The pure milk of God's Word is not to be adulterated with the chalk of human opinions.

In order to have faith, thou must work; faith is the reward of work.

Faith opens the door to the understanding; but Unbelief closes the eyes of the soul. As food is poison to an unhealthy palate, so the Word of God is distasteful to sinners. The honey of God's Word is sweet to him who has the palate of faith.

The Catholic Faith has grown in strength and clearness from the oppositions of heretics. Honey,—taken from the carcase of the slain lion,—feeds Faith (cp. Judges xiv. 8, 9, 18).

How can any one have Christ as his Head, who divides the Church which is His body? How great is the guilt of Schism, which (in the words of S. Cyprian and S. Ignatius) even the blood of martyrdom cannot wipe away!

O Heresy, O Schism, thou cruel harlot, blush to be judged by the true Solomon: the real mother would not allow her child to be divided (1 Kings iii. 16—28); thou dividest thy Lord Himself! (*S. Augustine.*)

Schismatics assign priestly acts to laymen. Their bond of Unity is schism. (*Tertullian.*) That which is found to have been the same among many (primitive Christians) is not an error but a truth; that which is more primitive is more true; that is most primitive which is from the beginning. (*Tertull.*).

Time which is spent on prayer is more precious than gold: an hour devoted to God lasts for a thousand years. Pray, with thy mouth, with thy heart, and with thy life.

If thou desirest to pray in a temple, pray in thyself; be a temple of God.

In the storms of life, moor thyself, by the anchor of faith, to the shore of prayer.

God hears the heart. Watch with thy heart; shut out the noise of the world, in order that the gate of heaven may be opened to thee in prayer.

Place thyself in the sight of God, and adore Him in silence. Behold Him present, with thy whole mind.

Even sadness for not praying well, is an act of prayer.

God does not forbid us to do well before men, either in prayer or alms-giving, but to do these things in order to be seen of men.

When thou prayest before men, enter into the closet of thy heart; when thou doest alms before men, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth. Whatever thou doest before men, do it not unto men, but unto God. Let the crowd of the World be to thee a solitude with God.

Be seen to do good, but do not do good to be seen.

The intention of the heart is its cry to God; our thoughts are heard in heaven. If thou criest to God, cry where God hears thee, within thyself.

Christians so converse with one another, as men who know that God is listening to them.

He that asserts Christ to be only God, denies the remedy by which he has been healed; he who asserts Christ to be only Man, denies the power by which he has been created.

In our Lord's sentence (John x. 30), "I and the Father are one" (*unum*, one substance), Christ overthrew Arianism by the word "*one*" (*unum*); by the words "*we are*" He overthrew Sabellianism.

In breathing on His disciples and giving them the Holy Ghost thereby (John xx. 22), He showed His two Natures; as Man He breathed; as God He gave God the Holy Ghost.

The Cross of Christ has passed from Calvary, the place of execution, to the foreheads and diadems of Kings; if so great is the honour of Christ's Suffering, how great will be the splendour of His Glory!

Christ underwent for us an unmerited death, in order that we by His death might have an unmerited life.

In the first Adam, it was shown what was the force of free will to procure for us death; in the second Adam it was shown what was the power of Grace, to procure for us life.

The whole human race is, as it were, two men, Adam and Christ, Death and Life.

Whatever is less than God, is not God.

God became Man; what will Man become, for whom God became Man?

Let man blush to be proud, for whom God stooped to be humble.

Man fell by pride; God used humility to exalt us to heaven.

A proud man is a great misery; what a mercy is there in God becoming humble for man's sake!

Christ prays for us, as our Priest; He prays in us, as our Head; He hears our prayers, as our God.

No one can lift anything to the place where he himself is, unless he stoops to the place where it is. Therefore God became Man.

Christ sought thee, when a sinner, to redeem thee; now that He has found thee and redeemed thee, will He forsake thee?

How rich will Christ make thee by His wealth, since He has made thee so rich by His poverty?

The malefactor believed in Christ, hanging on the Cross, and was carried by Him to Paradise; what will become of those who despise Christ reigning in heaven?

God is ever working—and at rest.

God uses bad things well, but the Devil uses good things ill; the Devil concocts poison from the honey of God.

God marks the actions which the World slights; God ignores the actions which the World applauds. Prize thou nothing apart from God.

If thou desirest peace, desire to please God.

Let Christ be fixed in thy heart, Who was fixed for thee on the Cross.

My Love has been crucified. (*S. Ignat.*)

Consider the three days of Christ, crucified, dead, buried, and rising again; and represent those three days in thy own life.

Two loves built two Cities; love of self built the earthly city, love of God the heavenly.

He alone knows how to love himself aright, who loves God. Love is the chariot which conveys us to our heavenly home. Let a man ask himself what he loves, and he will soon find out to what City he belongs, —the City of this World, or the City of God.

Our loves make our lives.

That man whom God pleases, pleases God. They who please themselves displease Him.

Holy men treat holy things holily.

Live, but live to God; living to the world is a work of death; living to God is a living life.

This is true love,—to love God for God's sake.

He alone loves himself, who compares nothing to God.

Why are some men more holy than others? By having God more fully dwelling in them.

Good men fear sin from love of virtue; bad men avoid sin from fear of punishment.

If we will to live well, let us love more what God promises, than what is promised by the World; and let us fear more what God threatens, than what is threatened by the World.

To know God is life; not to know Him is death; to serve God is to reign as a King; not to serve Him is to be the Devil's slave.

What is the use of knowing all the causes of things, if thou shunnest what thou oughtest to do, or doest what thou oughtest to shun?

We do not test the faith by men, but we test men by the faith.

Thou, O King, threatenest me with a prison for disobeying thee, but God threatens me with hell for not obeying Him.

God trains and crowns good men by means of bad men.

No works are good, which are not done in faith and love. Faith is the root; Hope the flower; Love the fruit.

We cannot have the life of the blessed, unless we love it.

God is the End of our desires. He will hereafter be seen without end, He will be loved without any cloying of our love. He will be praised without weariness. This will be the End which has no End.

Learning without Love puffs up. Love without Learning leads astray.

Forgetfulness of God is the sleep of the soul.

He who desires God, desires joy; do thou desire joy, not in thyself but in Him. Our heart is right with Him, when we desire Him for His own sake.

We shall see God more clearly, in proportion as we are more like Him.

O God, my power comes from Thy Command. Give me power to do what Thou commandest, and then command Thou what Thou willest. Thou by commanding a thing makest it good for me to do.

The Word of God commanding becomes the power of Man obeying.

Let the life, O Christ, which Thou livedst, live in my heart. The life which Thou hast given me, hide with Thyself in God.

Every command of God is easy to him who loves God; as the wings of a bird do not weigh it down to earth, but waft it upward to the sky.

Grace goes before us, in order that we may will; and Grace follows us, that we may not will in vain.

When God rewards thy good deeds, He crowns His own gifts. Whatever thou doest well, is an argument how much thou owest to Him; thou doest nothing well but what He enables thee to do. Man's power is nothing, without God's grace; He makes us to do whatever we do aright.

Prayer itself is a gift of Grace; Grace is called Grace, because it is given gratis. What am I without Thee, O God, but a leader of myself to a precipice?

God's Grace is man's Teacher. Reason needs Grace; but Grace has use of Reason.

God wills our will to be free; but if we desire to maintain man's free will, let us not impugn God's grace, by means of which man's Will uses its freedom aright.

If there is no such thing as God's grace, how can He save the World? but if there is no such a thing as Man's free will, how can He judge the World?

Man does not cause past things to be done, by remembering them; and God does not cause future things to be done, by foreseeing them; God foresees all future things, but forces nothing.

Good men are sure of the reward of perseverance; but they are not sure that they themselves will persevere.

In the precious stones of the breastplate of the Hebrew High Priest God placed the *Urim* and *Thummim* (i. e. *Lights* and *Perfections*); so He has put Grace into Scriptures and Sacraments, in order that we may be enlightened and perfected thereby.

Also He has infused grace into holy souls, that they may become precious stones, and shine for ever in the heavenly Jerusalem.

Adam fell asleep in Paradise, and God made Eve his spouse out of his opened side as he slept. Christ, the Second Adam, fell asleep in death on the Cross; and out of His pierced side came forth Blood and Water, the Sacramental Streams, to which the Church, His Eve and Bride, owes her life; and those Sacramental Streams, which derive their virtue from His Sacrifice, are applied to faithful souls, for their eternal life.

Sacraments do not save the faithless; but God saves the faithful by means of Sacraments.

If Christ is with us, Cobwebs are Walls; if Christ is against us, Walls are Cobwebs.

Man's midnight is God's noon.

Let thy face, like that of Moses, shine to others, by communing with God; but do not make it a looking-glass for thyself.

Fear thou to be praised now by the popular breath of man, lest thou be cast down hereafter by the unerring judgment of God.

When thou art praised by men, despise thyself. Let Him be praised Who works thy works in thee, and by thee. Render to God the praise, lest thou be condemned by Him. And do not rejoice because thou art praised, but rejoice for the sake of God's glory, and thy neighbour's good.

Do not boast of thine own deeds. God is crowning His own grace. If thou countest thy merits, what are they but His gifts?

It is great glory, to displease the bad.

The shepherd, who praises the wolf, hates the sheep.

The Priest, who praises heretics and schismatics, is a hireling.

He, who least hunts for the honours of this world, will receive the greatest glory from God.

Woe to the man whose charioteer is Pride.
If thou art a Phaeton, thou wilt surely have an Eridanus.

God's Vengeance dogs the proud.

The forfeiture of grace is a proof of pride.

The aping of humility is the apex of pride.

Grace, poured down from God, is received by the concave of humility; but it is thrown off by the convex of pride.

Is thy knowledge nothing, except others know thee to know it?

"On travaille trop pour la gazette."

St. Paul was greater than others, because he wished all to be equal to himself.

The Devil fell by pride; Christ was exalted by Humility; we cannot ascend without it. Pride hates companionship, and wishes to be eminent alone.

In order to appear good, be good.

Men praise thee, and know nothing.
God knows all things, and holds His peace.

When thou doest good, beware of pride; he who does good, and is proud of it, falls by his own goodness.

What is the use of giving money to the poor, if thou art made more proud by giving, than thou wast by possessing?

What use is it, to have the body emaciated by abstinence, if the mind is inflated by pride? What use is it, not to drink wine, and to be intoxicated by hatred?

What use is it to be pallid with fasting, and to be livid with envy?

Humble Marriage is holier than proud Virginity.

It is a great happiness, not to be overcome by happiness.

This be thy brazen wall,
To have a good conscience, and to grow pale through no crime.

The praise of him who collauds thee, cannot heal thy bad conscience; and the blame of him who censures thee, cannot hurt thy good one.

No pain, how great pain!

The man who proudly pleases himself, pleases a fool.

What is more miserable than a miserable sinner not commiserating himself?

Let us not talk great things, but live them.

It is better to hold one's peace, and to be real, than to talk, and to be not real.

Shun pleasures; pleasure hurts when bought by pain.

If the vessel is not sweet, whatever thou pourest into it will turn sour.

Thy body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, and a member of Christ, and will rise from the grave like to His body, if it be hallowed by chastity.

The mortification of the flesh is the glorification of the spirit.

John the Baptist (the preacher of repentance) is ever the forerunner of Jesus Christ, and is always preparing the way for Him.

Do not buy the fleeting pleasures of a single hour, or of a little day, with great suffering of mind and body.

How canst thou mount from the sty to the sky? (a cœno ad cœlum, *Tertullian,*) from earthly lusts to heavenly light?

How great a pleasure is it, to despise pleasure! it is virtuous to refrain from even lawful joys.

Mortify thy body, crucify the rebel flesh; and a beautiful crown for thy head will be given thee by thy future Judge.

The love of earthly things is the birdlime of our spiritual wings.

Think of the Cross, and thou wilt deem money to be mire.

Sweet it is, to be without vain sweetnesses.

I suffer pain of body and of mind, in order that I may be weaned from worldly delights. But what can I do? Nothing, O God, unless I have Thy grace. Have mercy upon me, and help me!

Let Temperance cleanse the body, which will mount above the stars, and is the temple in which Thou dwellest, O God.

Deem it the worst of crimes, to prefer life to honour, and for life's sake to lose the reasons for living.

If thou confessest Christ before men, He will confess thee before the Angels; but if thou deniest Him, thou wilt be denied by Him. Art thou ashamed of Christ? That Christ may be ashamed of thee!

He who loves to be praised by men, when he is blamed by Christ, will not be defended by men, when he is judged by Christ.

If thou art faithful, then, when thou art near the sword, thou art near to God; when thou art in the midst of wild beasts, thou art in the hand of God.

Though thy feet be in the stocks, thy heart is above the stars.

The cry of the Martyrs was, O Lord, deliver me from the *fear* of the enemy.

Grapes are trodden in the winepress, and wine flows from them; thou art like the bush in the wilderness, burning but not consumed. The Church of God, the spouse of Christ, is a lily among thorns (Song of Solomon ii. 2). Such is every faithful soul, that has been espoused to Christ in Baptism. I groan here in the body, but I rejoice in hope of hereafter. Thou groanest in the earthly threshing-floor, but thou wilt rejoice in the heavenly garner.

From the bruised olive streams the liquid oil.

The grass is mown, and it becomes sweet hay. Earth is our inn, heaven is our home.

Let the chaff fear the fire; but what can the fire do to the gold? The earthen vessel is put into the furnace, not to be broken, but to be baked. Afflictions are the flowers, of which the heavenly crown is woven. The way from earth to the stars is not smooth.

To do well and to suffer ill, is royal, nay, divine.

He who does not suffer ill well, cannot come to great glory.

The Sun has no spectators, but when it is eclipsed.

The good grain remains on the threshing-floor, the chaff is swept away by the wind. Tribulation proves what a man's faith is. By persecution the hireling is distinguished from the good shepherd.

The bitter water (of affliction) is sweetened by casting in the wood (of Christ's Cross). Cp. Exod. xv. 25.

If thou art afraid of being shipwrecked, lay hold of the wood of the Cross.

Thou wilt be free, if thou art a servant; free from sin, by serving Christ. The service of the Devil is the worst slavery; the service of Christ is the only freedom.

Our will is more free, in proportion as it is more healthy; and our will is more healthy, in proportion as it is more subject to the will of God.

Our free will is a gift of God's grace.

How can a man's will be said to be free, if it is the slave of lusts, conquering and constraining it?

The power of hurting themselves and others, is by some called freedom.

Commit thyself wholly to God, and endure all things; He will not try thee beyond thy power to endure.

Christ has taught thee, what not to fear, and what to hope for. Thou fearedst death; He has died. Thou didst not hope to rise again; He rose from the dead. He died and rose again for thee in that human nature which He took of thee.

That man swims smoothly, whose chin is held up by the hand of God.

The waves cannot rage beyond the shore.

When the shore is reached at last,
Who will count the billows past?

We are appointed to suffer adversities, lest we, who are travellers to our heavenly country, should love our inn as our home.

Μὴ βλέπε τὰ ἴδια, ἀλλα τὰ ἀΐδια.
(This cannot be adequately rendered into English.)

Let not sleep close thine eyelids, before thou hast thrice gone over in thy mind the works of the past day. Where did I go astray? What did I do? What have I left undone?

Good things are hard; dogged labour conquers all things; nothing is given to mortals without it. The gods sell to us all blessings for labour.

All our life is a trial.

If thou shirkest care, thou shrinkest from virtue.

In proportion as thou carest more for the common weal than for thine own, so much more, be sure, hast thou advanced in virtue.

To those great men of old, their private fortune was scanty; the common weal was large.

I had rather have a drop of wisdom than a sea of wealth (*S. Greg. Naz.*).

More pains, More gains.

If duty calls thee, hasten to obey the call, and the less thou wishest to go, the more do thou resolve to go.

The brightest lightnings are from the blackest clouds.
The gold shines more brightly from the most scorching fire.

The disease that tortures thy limbs, often brings health to thy soul. God heals and revives thee by smiting thee.

Plunge it in the deep, and it comes out more fair.

Never doubt about doing, what thou knowest thou oughtest to do; and never do that, which thou doubtest whether it ought to be done.

What are plainly sins, ought not to be done, on any plea of a good motive or end.

Him, only him, the hand of God defends
Whose *means* are pure and spotless as his *ends.*

Be ambitious to be quiet; and to do thine own business.

It is not enough, to shun evil, unless thou doest what is good; it is not enough to hurt nobody, unless thou triest to help as many as thou canst.

In order that thou mayest do thy duty, be content with doing it.

Remember needless things to flee,
That needful may be done by thee.

Do not intrude into another man's diocese.

The man who hunts two hares, catches neither.

No one ought to be so leisurely, as to neglect the good of others; nor to be so busy, as to forego communion with God.

The love of Truth longs for holy leisure; the necessity of Love undertakes reasonable duty.

If thou troublest thyself (by remorse), thou wilt not be troubled by God.

Confusion of self by repentance in this life is salutary; confound thyself willingly now, lest God confound thee by eternal pain, and so thou be destroyed by everlasting confusion.

Consider the times; and watch for His coming Who is beyond all time.

Redeem for thyself the opportunity; "turning the dust of servile opportunity to gold."

Who are the enemies of the Church? Heathens, Mohammedans, Jews. Who are her greater enemies? Bad Christians. Who are her greatest enemies? Bad Priests.

Thou who art a Priest of Christ, listen to the voice of thy Master. A good Shepherd ought not to seek for his own things, but to spend them for Him.

Let thy heart be made a temple of God, by reading, by prayer, and meditation.

In order that thou mayest be a reservoir (of the living water of divine truth), thou must first learn to be a channel: do not try to pour it out (in sermons), before thou thyself art well filled.

Præsis ut prosis.

Thy hand be on the helm, thine eye be on the stars.

Not to go forward, is to go backward.

Oversee, and tend, the flock of God; gather the sheep, guide them, and goad them on by thy pastoral crook, and thou wilt receive a crown from the Chief Shepherd.

The teacher's error is the people's trial, and so much the greater trial, the greater the teacher is.

He will never learn, who is ashamed to be taught; and he will never teach, who is angry with those whom he teaches.

I rejoice to hear that preacher's voice, who does not seek to elicit the hearers' praise, but their tears. The true preacher never tries to please by words, but by things; he is not the slave of words, but words serve him. Pray first, and then preach. It is safer for thee to listen to others than to preach thyself. And unless thou art on fire in preaching, thou wilt never kindle others.

Pray and plough: break up the fallow ground.

It is a disgrace for a priest to aim to be rich. Read often the Holy Scripture, nay, never let it out of thy hands; learn there what to teach; let not thy life confute thy teaching, lest thy hearers say to thee, Why dost thou not practise what thou preachest? Let the tears of thy hearers be thy praise. I would not have thee a rhetorical declaimer, but a teacher well skilled in the mysteries and sacraments of the Gospel. It is the part of unlearned preachers to pour out a torrent of words glibly, and to court the popular applause of the ignorant by volubility of utterance. Let not the clownish and simple brother count himself holy, because he is ignorant; nor let the learned and eloquent preacher measure holiness by the gifts of the tongue. Let us meditate on the Cross of Christ, and we shall count money as mire. Do not have itching ears; speak evil of no man, and listen to no man speaking evil of others. No one repeats slanders in an unwilling ear. The arrow does not stick in a stone. Let the slanderer learn to abstain from slandering by seeing thee distressed by hearing it. (*S. Jerome.*)

The hearer of Scripture ought to be like the clean animals of the Levitical law; he ought to chew the cud by ruminating upon what he hears, and he ought to divide the hoof by walking steadily in it.

It is better to doubt concerning what is obscure, than to wrangle concerning what is uncertain.

In necessary things let there be Unity; in doubtful things, Liberty; in all things, Charity.

In the one Faith, there is no harm in a variety of rites and ceremonies; rather, a diversity of rites and ceremonies brings out in bolder relief the unity of the one Faith.

We alarm, because we fear; knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men (2 Cor. v. 11).

Let not those, who are not priests, however eminent they may be in eloquence and ability, intrude into priestly acts. And let not those who are priests, be despised by their flocks, although they may not be distinguished by those gifts. What is the use of a golden key, if it cannot open a door? and what is the harm of a wooden one, if it can open it?

Our patience is tried by troubles. That man conquers, who is patient; he who is impatient is conquered.

It is the height of virtue to bear with the malicious tempers of others; and with a peace-making mind to love the enemies of peace.

No one has the love of God who does not love the Unity of His Church. Sacraments may exist in schism, but they do not profit except in Unity.

Spiritual gifts profit us when joined with the grace of love. But they are of no avail without it.

He who errs, and humbly laments his error, is a better man than he who does well, and vain-gloriously boasts of what he has done.

He who binds a man in a phrenzy, and he who arouses one in a lethargy, is hated by both, and loves both.

Blessed is he who loves his friend in God, and loves his enemy for God.

To be angry is human, but to cease from anger is Christian.

It is more laudable to receive correction with meekness, than to correct with sharpness.

S. Athanasius was like adamant to those who smote him, and like a magnet to those who differed from him. (*S. Greg. Nazianz.*)

Thou wilt do more good by admonishing amiably, than by menacing angrily.

Be true in Love; Truth is the best Love. True love is not without its hire, but it is not a hireling. Nothing will hurt the man who deals gently with his enemy; if thou dealest rightly with thy foe, he will become thy friend.

He who willingly detracts from my good name, is adding unwillingly to my future reward, if I treat the detractor with love, and pray for him to God.

Render not evil for evil; pray for those who slander thee: Prayer is a strong weapon to a loving soul.

That man is a greater hero who conquers himself, than he who conquers the strongest city; he is a king who rules himself. He who conquers anger, conquers his greatest enemy.

There will come a time (says *Hooker*), when three words uttered with charity will receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit.

Be sober, as the athlete of God. Stand steadfast, as an anvil when struck.

Do not love vice for the sake of men, nor hate vicious men for their vices: love the erring, shun their errors; have war with vices, but follow peace with all men. If thou lovest thy friend, love not his errors; but because thou lovest him, try to deliver him from them.

It is better to love a man with severity, than to be careless of his soul without verity. (*S. Aug.*)

No one can be truly a man's friend, who is not a friend of Truth.

Not everything that we like, is lawful; not everything that is lawful, is expedient.

All things are free, through Faith; all things serve, through Love.

Love is like a Mother; with some she is in childbirth; with others she is weak; to others she stoops; to others she raises herself; to some she is strict, to others, gentle; a servant of all, an enemy to none.

It is better that offences should arise, than that Truth should be betrayed; we must never *give* offence, though others may *take* it. Good things are an offence to no one but to an evil mind.

Oneness is better than one.

Out of the world's thorns pluck for thyself a crown of roses; the thorny sprig often bears an unfading rose.

No saint in this world is without tears; nay, the more saintly he is, the more he weeps for sin.

Oil speeds the wheels; vinegar rusts them.

Evils exercise and excite the good; be thou good, and be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

It is not the death that makes the Martyr, but the cause. Death makes the chains of Martyrs to be crowns.

Why does my enemy exult over me? My heavenly Father makes use of him as a scourge, to train me for my heavenly home.

Death came in with Adam by sinning, righteousness was fulfilled in Christ by dying. Christ died, that Death might die by His dying.

Live every day as about to die, if thou desirest to die as about to live for eternity.

Let Truth dwell in thy mouth, Love in thy heart; Chastity and Purity in thy lips, thy heart, and thy body.

We cannot resist our persecutors, except by Love.

The hatred of thy enemy cannot hurt thee, but thou hurtest thyself by hating him. Thou art hurt more by thine own enmity than by thy enemy. Love thine enemy, and the ill he does thee will be thy good.

He who forges fraud against another, forges it against himself: the crafty man is caught in his own snare. He who devises evil against another, devises it against himself. He who has sinned against another, has first sinned against himself.

He who scatters seed for the good of the Church, gathers a harvest for himself.

A certain friend is discerned in an uncertain matter.

Qui suadet, sua det.

He gives twice who gives in a trice.

Give to *every one* that asketh thee; but do not give *everything* he asks.

It is part of conferring a favour, to deny it graciously.

Thou committest seed to the earth, and gatherest a rich harvest. Thou committest wealth to Christ, and dost thou think it will die?

Charity grows by use, and becomes rich by giving.

To neglect gain seasonably, is the greatest gain. Gain gotten with an evil name is great loss. Thou gettest gain, if thou spendest in piety to God.

Prayer without almsgiving is barren and unprofitable.

The miser lacks what he has, as well as what he has not. A poor man lacks many things, but a miser lacks everything.

εἰ χρήματ' ἐστὶν, ὠφελεῖ τὰ κτήματα.

If thou *usest* well what thou *hast*, then thou *hast* what thou *usest*.

Dost thou wish to be a wise merchant? Give thy time to God, and thy money to the poor.

When thou doest well, do it cheerfully; if thou doest it grudgingly, it is not done by thee, but out of thee.

No one does well, who does it grudgingly, although that which he does may be good.

Use hospitality one to another without grudging; giving willingly, glad to distribute, ministering to necessities of saints. He that hath pity, let him do it with cheerfulness. God loveth a cheerful giver.

Money, heaped up by a man, is either his servant or his tyrant.

A man does not possess, but is possessed, who desires to be rich to himself, and is poor to God.

You cannot rightly call him happy who has much wealth; but he is happy, who uses well what God has given him.

Thou art not rich by having much, but by wanting little.

Extend thy small income by limiting thy desires.

What thou givest is the only wealth thou wilt never lose. Give while thou hast time; be thine own heir. No one will be able to take away from thee what thou hast given to God.

The rich believer counts his wealth as sand.

The envious man grows thin by seeing the fatness of others. Envy is a worse torment than any that was invented by the tyrants of Sicily. Anger is brief madness; rule thy temper, which, if thou dost not restrain it, will rule thee.

Give not way to evil, but march more bravely against it.

Dare to despise wealth; but never despise the poor.

This is true wealth—to live frugally with gladness.

A man may rival the wealth of Kings by a contented mind.

In olden time the glory of *giving*, was thought greater than that of having titles and coronets.

No one is hurt but by himself. No bad man is happy. Bear and forbear. Be gentle in manner, but energetic in work.

Dare to be wise. Grave in act, serious in word, serene in mien, calm in attitude. Do not to others what thou wouldest not done to thyself, but do to them what thou wouldest done to thee.

What is well begun is half done.

If thou condemnest others, thou wilt be condemned; if thou forgivest others, thou wilt be forgiven. Dost thou judge God's servant, thy own brother? We shall all stand at His judgment-seat; and if thou art angry with thy brother, how wilt thou appease thy Father?

Slander, and listening to slander,—both will incur condemnation.

He is a perfect man who neither slips with his tongue, nor drinks in slanderous words with a thirsty ear.

Leave off *slandering* me with thine *ears*.

(Words on S. Augustine's table.)
Whoever loves to backbite an absent friend, let him know that this table is no place for him.

Rejoice with him that rejoiceth; we are members one of another. My nature is to fraternize with others in their love, but not in their hate.

Every man has his own failings; but we do not see the wallet behind our own backs.

Do not envy the good deeds of others, but rejoice in them. Thou hatest thyself, if thou enviest them; thou lovest thyself, if thou lovest them. He who hates another hates himself by his hatred; but he who loves another does good to himself. Look not at thine own things, but at the things of others.

Love the good name of thy enemy. He who loves another's soul loves his own; he who cares not for another's soul, destroys his own.

Dost thou desire to find good men? be a good man thyself. Trust others; trust begets trust. In order that thou mayest not be despised, despise no man. Every hair has its own shadow.

Take good heed *what* thou sayest, *to whom*, and *of whom*.

He who buys land, buys strife; a loving home is the best house.

When you want another to keep a secret, keep it yourself.

Admonish thy friend privately, praise him openly.

Be true in all things; Truth is ever right.

It is a noble conquest, to be conquered by the Truth.

Talk with the vulgar, think with the wise.

If you wish to catch him who runs, run fast.

A gilt bridle does not better the horse.

Troubled water will not make a looking-glass.

Better to limp in the way of truth, than to trip along out of the way. Be not proud outside the way of truth, nor lazy in it.

Everything has two handles: take thou hold of the right.

One man is no man.

Goodness is not in greatness, but greatness is in goodness.

Think long on what thou must decide once.

Let good things be done well. A good *intention* makes a good act, provided it is done to the Glory of God, and according to His Law.

That man cannot be said to write, whose writings no one reads.

Small cares are talkative, great cares are dumb. Cowardly dogs bark loudly; hollow vessels make the most noise.

Qui nihil audet, nihil gaudet.

You may conquer more easily by counsel than by passion.

Sapiens *senescit*, non *segnescit*.
The wise man grows old, ever learning something new.

Art thou better and milder, as thou growest older,
As wine becomes more mellow by age?

It is the sweetest of all lives to feel daily growing better.

Expenditure of time is the most costly of all; no avarice is honourable but that of time.

Train thyself to live hereafter with Angels, by living as an Angel here.

Follow not thine own spirit, if thou desirest to have the Spirit of God.

Does Time seem long to thee? it is short to God. Submit to God, and what is far off will soon come.

Many are not ashamed of sin, who are ashamed to repent of it; they are not ashamed of their wounds, but of their bandages.

Resist the beginning of evils; it is too late to heal them when they become inveterate by delay.

Do not oscillate on the momentum of a doubtful hour; trust God; sufficient to the day is its own care.

Do not hang aloft swinging in the air in anxiety; have faith in God, and receive with love whatever He appoints. Do not repine at thy lot; but rejoice in everything, and give God thanks.

That is not to be called a bad death, which has been preceded by a good life; he cannot die ill, who lives well.

Qualis vita,
Finis ita.

There is a scorching glare in the world, but there is a cool shade under the wing of God.

The Devil is allowed to tempt thee so far as is good for thee, if thou art advancing in the way of Godliness.

We call them happy who have learnt to bear the discomforts of life, and not to toss the yoke, under its discipline.

He is to be feared who fears God. The wise man rules the stars. The good man is a king, when a slave; the bad man is a slave, when a king.

They are to be praised who are unwilling to prosper with the World's prosperity, and to perish with the World's perdition.

What great pains men take to be miserable eternally!

If we love wealth, let us love to have it in heaven, where it will never fail; if we love honour, let us love to have it where no one will envy us; if we love health, let us love to have it where there is no disease nor death, but where all will live for ever. Let all our loves therefore be in heaven.

Him, whom no happiness corrupts with its smiles, no unhappiness will crush by its frowns.

All Virtues are consummated in Love. Temperance is Love, reserving itself wholly to God; Fortitude is Love, enduring all things for His sake; Justice is Love, serving God, and therefore ruling others well in those things which are subject to man; Prudence is Love, discerning aright between those things which bring us near to God, and those which draw us away from Him.

If thy heart is in heaven, the tears of thine eyes will be dried up.

Dost thou desire to have what Christ has? Fear not to suffer what He suffered. He says, I am the Way, the Truth, the Life (Via, Veritas, Vita); the Way, by which we must walk; the Truth, at which we hope to arrive; the Life, which we hope to live for evermore.

The earthly gate is strait, but the heavenly city, to which it leads, is wide. Per angusta itur ad augusta. The way is narrow to labour, but is wide to love.

That man is happy, not who has what he loves, but who loves what is worth loving, and worth having for ever.

In the way wherein thou walkest as a pilgrim this is thy delight, that it leads thee to thy heavenly home.

The beginning of life is also the beginning of death to us who are born to die.

The Martyr's death-day is his birthday.

How glorious will it be for us to have a sunset to the world in order to have a sunrise to Christ (*S. Ignat.*); to close our eyes to the world to open them on Him.

Oh that I could fly with a dove's wings, that I might glide to my heavenly nest.

Our brethren who have fallen asleep in Christ have not left us, but have gone before us.

Let us gild our wings by communion with Christ.

Love not thy life nor hate, but what thou livest
Live well: how long or short, commit to God.

Know the opportunity. Do nothing overmuch. Moderation is best. Meditation is all in all.

What is Life? Meditation for Death.

In the voyage of life look not at the ships around thee, but at the stars above thee.

What can be called long that has an end?

To us who are heirs of Eternity, Adam lived yesterday.

Time how short! Eternity how long!

O my God, Thou dwellest in silence, alone, majestic; smiting illicit desires with penal blindness.

Woe to thee, thou stream of human fashion, who rollest away in thy torrent the sons of Eve into a dangerous sea, which even they can hardly traverse who have embarked in the ship of the Cross.

Thou fearest shipwreck, and yet dost thou hug the leaden weight of earthly things? Lay hold of the wood of the Cross, and thou wilt swim.

Of the Eternal City, the King is Truth; the Law is Love; the franchise, Eternity.

Mors est ventura; ne fac quæ scis nocitura.

Our Millenniums hang on our Moments.

Our hours pass by, and are put down to our account.

God punishes some things in this world. lest we should doubt of His Providence; He leaves many things unpunished, that we may look for a Judgment to come.

The days of thy Death and of Judgment are unknown to thee, in order that every day of thy life may be observed by thee.

Such as we are at our death we shall be at the judgment; therefore consider the end. If thou livest well, what harm can death do to thee who art mortal?

At sunrise think of thine own rising from the grave; at sunset think of thy sleep in death.

Meditate daily on the last five things; Death, Resurrection, Heaven, Hell, and Eternity; consider all things with reference to Eternity.

ALL GLORY BE TO GOD ALONE.

ON THE INCREASE OF INFIDELITY, AND THE NEED OF A LEARNED CLERGY.

A REMARKABLE document has lately been put forth by one of the most distinguished of French Bishops, the Bishop of Orleans.[1]

It is a calm, dispassionate statement, corroborated by ample evidence, of opinions prevalent in that great country, with regard to Religion and Morals, as displayed in its popular Literature. The spirit and language of that Literature as there exhibited equals, if not exceeds, in bold impiety anything that was vented and disseminated in that country in the days of Rousseau, Voltaire, and of the Reign of Terror. The Bishop of Orleans states his deliberate conviction, grounded on proofs which he adduces, that there is a deep-laid conspiracy[2] for unchristianizing the people, and for disorganizing and subverting the fabric of society.

It is not improbable that some of the audacious blasphemies quoted in his pages might be paralleled from our own contemporary literature. But the melancholy question which arises, and one which deeply concerns us is, What in that great country is now provided by the Church as an antidote for this deadly poison? The answer, it is to be feared, must be, that the present temper and practice of Ultramontanism, which unhappily has absorbed the Gallicanism of Bossuet and Fleury and Fénélon, and reigns supreme (as far as Religion is concerned) in Roman Catholic countries, are such as rather to aggravate the disease than

[1] *Où allons-nous?* par M. l'Évêque d'Orléans, Membre du Sénat. Paris, Douniol, 1876.

[2] Ibid.

to mitigate it. The Roman Papacy is endeavouring to act on the popular mind, not only by exorbitant claims to abject submission, and almost to divine worship, but by encouragement of frauds and superstitions, of false miracles and apparitions, and pilgrimages to objects of devotion canonized by itself. Rome is defying Reason and History, and is deifying itself, and is revolting the human intellect from Christianity and goading it to Unbelief.

And how are these dangers to be met? Not by civil penalties and legal coercion, such as are now being adopted in Germany. Loyalty, Patriotism, and Enthusiasm cannot be created by such agencies as these. No one is a martyr for negations. Rather they may aggravate the evil. Erastus does the work of Hildebrand.

Humanly speaking, the hopes of Christendom (let us say it with thankfulness not unmingled with fear), are with the Church of England, and the Churches in her communion in these kingdoms, and in our Colonies and in the United States of America, to which we may add the Old Catholics of continental Europe. No religious communion will be able to stand against the terrible storm which is about to sweep over Christendom, that does not appeal to Holy Scripture as its Rule of Faith, and which does not hold in its hands an open Bible, and which does not interpret that Bible according to the consent of the Church Universal as declared in the Creeds, and that does not preach the Word of God, and dispense the Christian Sacraments, by a body of faithful and learned men deriving their commission from Christ and His Apostles, by uninterrupted succession and lawful ordination.

Such a religious society, thanks be to God, the Church of England is.

But in order that the Church may do her proper work, she must shun strife, and cherish peace; and her Clergy must not degenerate from their character for learning and intellectual culture: rather they ought to make progress in those respects, in order to encounter successfully the dangers which threaten Society.

These remarks may introduce the following words read by me at "the Lambeth Conference" on July 4th, 1878:—

How is modern Infidelity to be dealt with? This involves the question, What are its causes? Among the principal ones (as it seems to me) is the present condition of the Clergy in Christendom. "Where there is no Vision the people perish" (Prov. xxix. 18). "Like People, like Priest," says the Prophet Hosea (ch. iv. 9), and another Prophet, Malachi, writes, "The Priest's lips should keep knowledge" (Malachi ii. 7). "Ye are the salt of the earth," says our Blessed Lord to His disciples, especially to the Clergy. "Ye are the light of the world; but if the salt loses its savour," and if the light is dimmed, what must the world be? We are not living in the middle ages. Every one now reads, every one in the upper classes professes to think. The nineteenth century requires a clear head, a strong hand, as well as a warm heart, enlightened by the Holy Spirit. But what is now the condition of the Clergy, the religious teachers of Christendom? In many countries the Christian Ministry has fallen into contempt, and has drawn down Christianity along with it. I will not speak anything on my own authority: but will appeal to the testimony of leading Ecclesiastics on this point. As to the Eastern Church, let me refer to the address delivered by Gregory, Metropolitan of Chios, and published by him at Constantinople two years ago. He there mourns over the illiterate condition of the Eastern Clergy secular and regular; and complains that the supply of candidates for Holy Orders is miserably scanty and mean. No wonder that religious indifference and unbelief prevail there.

Let us turn to the Western Church. As to Italy, the words of one of the most illustrious of its Ecclesiastics, the Abate Rosmini[3] are very significant. Among what he calls the "Cinque Piaghe della Santa Chiesa" (the five wounds of Holy Church), one of the most grievous, in his opinion, is the incompetency and degradation of the Clergy. They are of low origin and ill-educated. The recent surrender of all Episcopal appointments in Italy and Sicily to the Roman Pontiff will increase the mischief. So will the Syllabus; and the new dogmas of 1854 and 1870. Dr. Döllinger, in his

[3] See above, vol. i. p. 179, and pp. 175—178.

book "on the Church and Churches," echoes the same complaint: and the pathetic, but abortive appeal lately made by one of the most eloquent Prelates of France, Monseigneur Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, to the Senate of that country on behalf of the pauperized Priesthood and starved and stunted Seminaries of the French Church, gave clear evidence of the inability of her Clergy to cope with the scepticism of that quick and restless people. Reduced almost to mendicancy (you will remember the late Bishop of Winchester's statement in Convocation on this point) the Roman Catholic Priesthood in France has been tempted to trade in false miracles, apparitions and pilgrimages, in order to raise money; and by a mercenary traffic in pious frauds they have repelled the intelligent laity from Christianity, and driven them into Infidelity.

In Protestant Germany the state of things is little better. It has lost the Creeds and the Episcopate. A learned and pious Pastor and Expositor of Scripture, Dr. Rudolph Stier, laments that in the German Universities scarcely any of the Ecclesiastical Professorships of Dogmatic Theology, Church History, and Biblical Criticism are now filled by Clergymen; and this separation of the professorial Chair of the Universities from the Ministry of the Church has produced learned but sceptical Theologians and illiterate and rationalistic Pastors. The fountains of sacred Truth and Biblical Learning have been poisoned in the Colleges of Germany, and the streams in the towns and villages are polluted. No wonder that unbelief should prevail. No wonder that its necessary consequences, Socialism and Communism, should rear their heads and threaten the persons of sovereigns and the security of national institutions. Here is a warning for ourselves.

Two forms of anti-christianism are now dominant in Europe, and are acting and re-acting on each other in violent antagonism; and both are equally hostile to religion and to society; Ultramontanism on the one side, and Infidelity on the other. And the Christian Church, as represented by her Bishops and Clergy, is almost powerless to save the Laity from Secularism and Scepticism, and to win them back to

the Faith. My right reverend brethren, it would seem as if the hopes of Christendom were now concentrated on the English and American Churches; and if these hopes rest on the Anglo-American Church, surely they depend on the efficiency of the Anglo-American Episcopate and of the Anglo-American Priesthood. They depend mainly on their piety, learning, wisdom, energy, zeal, charity, and unity. Thank God we have much to encourage us. This our gathering of Bishops as brethren at Lambeth, from the four quarters of the world, cheers and strengthens us. We have numberless other signs of God's presence with us, and of His blessing upon us. But have we not also much to alarm us? The Church of England seems to be losing her hold on her ancient Colleges; at least that hold is much weakened. Our Universities are almost ceasing to be "Schools of the Prophets." Our Nobility and Gentry seem reluctant to dedicate their sons to the service of Christ and His Church. A great part of the revenues of our Cathedrals have been applied to other purposes, and is no longer available for the encouragement of sacred Learning and Theological Science. We are in danger of declining from that high position which the Clergy of the Church of England has held for three centuries; and this unhappily at a time when Literature and Science are eagerly stimulated in other professions, and when a restless and reckless spirit of speculation doubts and discusses everything. The din of the battle is now sounding in our ears. How shall we meet it? If the fortress of the Faith is to be defended, and if also our troops are to be led forth with hope of victory and conquest into the domains of Unbelief, they must be not only increased, but be better disciplined. We need a learned Clergy, skilled in Languages and Literature, and in Moral, Metaphysical, and Natural Science. We require more of sound, definite, dogmatic teaching, more knowledge of Holy Scripture and Church History for our Priesthood; we need more of breadth and depth and height in the education of our Candidates for Holy Orders. How can this be obtained? By Theological seminaries or otherwise. By the quickening of the inner life of our Cathedrals. Ought we not also to en-

deavour to enlist the intellect of the rising generation and of the upper as well as of the middle classes of society by representing to them that (whatever some may think) Theology is the noblest of Sciences, the Queen of Sciences. Ought we not to remind them of such truths as were proclaimed to ancient Christendom in the East by S. Chrysostom in his work on the Priesthood, and in the West by S. Gregory the Great in his Pastoral, and were declared to our own forefathers by such men as George Herbert in his Country Parson, and by Bishop Bull in his sermon on the Priest's Office, and are embodied in our own Ordinal concerning the weighty charge and arduous difficulty of the Priest's Office, its high dignity and great excellency; and ought we not boldly to assert that there is no service in the world so honourable as that of the King of kings? And next, as has just been so eloquently pleaded before us by one of our right reverend brethren, let us be sure, and let us act and induce others to act in the confident persuasion, that eventually the Triumph of the Faith will be complete and eternal. These are matters which I venture to commend to your consideration.

One other point. It cannot be doubted that Infidelity is now greatly strengthened and encouraged by the unhappy divisions and controversies of the Clergy as to questions of doctrine, discipline, and ritual. The unbeliever says to us "First settle among yourselves what we are to believe, and how we are to worship God, and then come and preach to us,—*but not till then.*" The unbrotherly strifes and angry debates among our Clergy are exciting the scoffs and sneers of Infidels, and are alienating the confidence and affection of the Laity from us; and while some are being beguiled into Romanism by them, others are driven to Puritanism and Unbelief. Surely, my Lords, the time is come, when the Bishops of the Church should unite as one man in a firm resolve to maintain what is Scriptural and Catholic in doctrine and discipline in the Church; and to resist whatever is unscriptural and uncatholic; and also to uphold what our own National Churches have received, and have authoritatively decreed in their Synods, in ritual, and to resist what is unauthorized and Romish. Let us be all of one mind among

ourselves in defending the Truth of God and the Order of His Church, and His blessing will be on us.

Lastly, we know from the sure word of Prophecy that the last days will be days of Unbelief, and of rebuke and blasphemy. The nearer the Second Coming of Christ is, the more fierce will be the rage of Anti-Christ. "When the Son of Man cometh (asks our Blessed Lord), shall He find the faith on earth?" And when those days come, and who can say whether they may not now be near? the strength of the Church will be in cleaving to Holy Scripture and to Prayer. There is our armour against Unbelief, the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God; and the shield of Faith, continuing instant in Prayer. Those days may be days of martyrdom; and the Church may be like the proto-martyr, St. Stephen, first preaching boldly the truth from the Holy Scriptures, and then, when the storm of persecution rages about him, kneeling down in prayer, interceding for his persecutors, and commending his spirit to his Divine Lord, and so falling asleep in Him, to be awakened to Eternal Glory.

I will not anticipate the questions concerning the continuance or revision of our Authorized Version of Holy Scripture for the use of the whole Anglican Communion, and perhaps of one and the same Lectionary for all our Churches. These indeed would be golden bonds of union for us all. May I add that the appointment of some annual seasons of simultaneous Intercession throughout the whole Anglican Communion for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon us, and on the Churches committed to our charge, would strengthen us all in the faith, and enable us to contend earnestly for it?

Postscript.—Since the above paper was written, two remarkable publications have appeared in France; one by a French Ecclesiastic, the Abbé Bougaud, Vicar-General of Orleans, "*Le Grand Péril de l'Église de France*" (3rd Edition, Paris, 1878); the other, by a Layman, M. Eugène Reveillaud, "*La Question Religieuse*" (6th Edition, Paris, 1878).

The former gives an alarming picture of the condition of

the French Church, its poverty, its lack of learning, pp. 46—49, 87; the languishing state of its Theological Seminaries, and the failure of Candidates for Holy Orders; so that not less than 2,568 Parishes in France are now without Parish Priests (p. 38) and their populations are in danger of lapsing into heathenism. The latter writer investigates the causes of these phenomena; he attributes the failure of the influence of the French Church to its doctrinal errors and corruptions especially its late extravagances (such as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility), and the pious frauds and impostures (such as those of La Salette and Lourdes, see pages 7—36). He avows his conviction that the Church of France is unable to counteract the effects of Unbelief, and to avert the dangers which menace Society and the National Institutions of France. He avows himself no longer "a Catholic;" but he is in a state of alarm for his Country, and he declares that if France is to be saved, it can only be by Christianity.

What form of Christianity is to be adopted—is the subject of inquiry in the latter portions of his work.

Two remarkable Essays (written, it is said, by a French Seminarist) have been reprinted from the *Courrier de Lyon*, September, 1878, containing a review of the Abbé Bougaud's book. The Essayist, while fully admitting the truth of the Abbé's statements, affirms that the unhappy condition of the French Church is due in a great measure to itself; and he also asserts that if it is to exercise a moral and religious influence over the French Nation, and to save it from impending dangers, it must reform itself from within—especially that the system of clerical Education must be wholly different from what it is.

These questions have a deep interest for ourselves; they suggest motives of thankfulness for the constitution of our own Church—Scriptural, Primitive, Apostolic, and Catholic, and for the principles of the English Reformation; they are also fraught with salutary warning, lest the Clergy of the Church of England should incur the danger of forfeiting their own influence on the national mind and character. And they awaken a feeling of deep sympathy with the Clergy and

Church of France, and incite us to examine, whether by friendly intercourse, and earnest prayers, we might not do something, with the Divine blessing, to help in restoring the Church of France to the high position she occupied in the days of St. Irenæus, St. Hilary and St. Martin, and to repay the debt we owe her for the spiritual benefits conferred by her on ourselves in ancient times.

ON THE DESTINY OF MOHAMMEDANISM, ESPECIALLY IN THE TURKISH DOMINIONS.

The minds of men have been lately fixed on the East, and have been speculating on the destinies of the great Mohammedan Power, which rules at Constantinople. Let us inquire whether the Inspired Oracles shed any light on this subject.

When we consider that the religion of Mohammed has been in the world for more than twelve hundred and sixty years, and that it has spread over Africa, Asia, and a considerable part of Europe; and that it declares—to quote the words of the Koran,[1] which it receives as a Divine revelation—that "the true religion in the sight of God is Islam, and whosoever followeth any other religion shall be of those who perish;" and when we remember also that it has waged war for more than ten centuries against the Church of God, it would seem, *à priori*, to be hardly probable that no reference to Mohammedanism should be found in the Apocalypse, or Revelation of the Apostle and Evangelist St. John, which is a Divine prophecy concerning the Church of God, from the Apostolic age to the Second Coming of Christ. And while it appears to be likely that Mohammedanism would be described in it, we shall see good reason to agree with those learned men [2] who recognize it in the Ninth Chapter of that book. Let us examine it.

An angel sounds the Fifth Trumpet, and *a star* is seen which has *fallen from heaven*. In the language of the Apo-

[1] See the Koran, chaps. ii. and iii.

[2] Such as *Joseph Mede, Bishop Wilson* of Sodor and Man, *Bishop Newton, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Halifax, Professor White,* Bampton Lectures, 1784, *Bishop Van Mildert,* Boyle Lectures, *Rev. Isaac Williams* on the Apocalypse, and others.

calypse a Star is a Teacher of Christianity, a luminary in the firmament of the Church.[3] The fall of a star represents religious defection and apostasy. The fallen star is described in this prophecy as having the key of the bottomless pit, which is the abode of the powers of darkness.[4]

Out of this pit thus opened arises smoke, by which "*the sun and the air are darkened;*" and "*out of the smoke come forth locusts upon the earth, and they have power as scorpions;*" but they do "*not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree.*"

It is clear that these locusts are *not natural locusts,* for locusts do not issue forth from smoke, and locusts hurt the earth's vegetation: as the prophet Joel says, "The land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; and nothing escapes them."[5] These *locusts* therefore of the Apocalypse are not real, but *typical;* they represent a desolating power; and this power, in its ravages, is compared in the prophecy to *scorpions,* and to an army of *horses* rushing to the battle.

It has rightly been remarked that the terms *locusts, scorpions,* and *horses* point to *Arabia,* the native country of Mohammedanism. Swarms of locusts go forth like dark clouds from that region. The road from Arabia to Palestine is called "the passage of scorpions."[6] And the war-horse is the pride of Arabia, as described by the patriarch Job,[7] who dwelt in that country.

Let us inquire now, What gave birth to Mohammedanism? It was the smoke which darkened Christendom at the beginning of the seventh century, when that religion arose; it was the smoke arising from the bottomless pit, opened by the falling star; it was the smoke of error, of superstition, of idolatry, of bitter strife among Christians, engendered by some who once shone as *stars* in the firmament of the Church, and fell away from it, especially such false teachers as Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Apollinarius, and others. All writers

[3] Rev. i. 16, 20.
[4] See Luke viii. 31; Rev. xx. 1, 3.
[5] Joel ii.
[6] Num. xxxiv. 4. Judges i. 36. Cp. Deut. viii. 15.
[7] Job xxxix. 18.

on the history of Mohammedanism[8] agree in this, that it was due to the heresies and schisms of Christians, and to their creature-worship and idolatry; and it was used by God as a scourge to sting like the scorpion, and as a plague to spread like locusts, and to chastise degenerate churches. Yet further, the Koran itself—the Bible of Mohammedanism—is "compounded of Christian heresies," and "compiled from apocryphal gospels."[9]

To proceed. The locusts are said in the prophecy to hurt *only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads.* In the Apocalypse,[1] as well as in the prophecies of Ezekiel, those who "have the seal of God" are true believers. The prophecy therefore assures us that Mohammedanism does not hurt true Christians, but hurts others who are not loyal to Christ.

But it may perhaps be asked, Did not Mohammedanism hurt faithful Christians? No. It is true that Mohammedanism waged war against the Church, and put many faithful Christians to death. But Christ is more powerful than Mohammed, and He has given a blessed assurance to all true believers, that "*nothing shall in any wise hurt them.*" Our Lord's words are the best commentary on this prophecy; He foresaw these Mohammedan *scorpions;* "Behold," says He to His disciples, "I give you power to tread on serpents and *scorpions,* and upon all the power of the enemy, and *nothing shall in any wise hurt you.*"[2] Observe also, that in the Greek Gospel, the word for *hurt,* a remarkable one in

[8] *Dean Prideaux,* Preface to the Life of Mohammed, pp. v to vii: London, 6th ed. 1718. See also *Sale,* Preliminary Discourse to the Koran, sect ii.; *Gibbon,* History, chap. l.; *Hallam,* Middle Ages, chap. vi.; *Neander,* Church History, vol. v. p. 114; *Gieseler,* Church History, sect. 27; *Milman,* Latin Christianity, book iv. chap. i. *Isaac Williams* on the Apocalypse, p. 154, who says, "Mahomet himself was not a star fallen from heaven, but the smoke of the great corruption, ignorance, and idolatry which had hidden the Sun of righteousness gave rise to a definite form of evil which is seen developed in these locusts, or in Mahomet and his followers. *Tichonius* says that the star here falling to the earth is the body of many stars, through sin falling from heaven, *i. e.* from the Church."

[9] *Dr. Isaac Barrow,* ii. 202; iv. 228; *Milman* and *Hallam,* quoted above.

[1] Rev. vii. 8. Ezek. ix. 4.

[2] Luke x. 18.

our Lord's declaration, is the same word as here.[3] Our Lord also says that death for His sake is *life*, "Fear not them who kill the body, and afterward have no more that they can do;"[4] "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that *loseth his life for My sake shall find it;*"[5] "He that loveth his life shall lose it, and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."[6]

Therefore this prophecy is an encouragement. It assures the *faithful* of every age and country that they cannot be *hurt* by the *scorpions* of Islamism; and it is a warning to all who apostatize from the faith of Christ and embrace the creed of the Arabian impostor, that, though they may save their lives in this world, they will lose them in the world to come; and it goes on to say, that if they forsake their Lord through fear of death, or hope of worldly favour, their life, even here on earth, will be a wretched existence, like that of men who seek death and do not find it, and who may desire to die, and death flees from them; a miserable condition, represented as most shameful and agonizing by the patriarch Job and by the prophet Jeremiah in the sharpest paroxysms of their sufferings.[7]

This prophecy also clearly reveals the solemn truth that they who encourage and support Mohammedanism are warring against Christ.

It is next said in this prophecy that "*the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle.*" We may compare these words with those of the prophet Joel speaking of the Chaldæan armies coming against Jerusalem: "The appearance of them is as the appearances of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, as a strong people set in battle array;"[8] In like manner St. John here says, "The sound of their wings is as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle."[9] The Arabian cavalry are compared by him to the Arabian locusts. In some languages locusts[1] and horses have a similar name. Saracens and Otto-

[3] ἀδικεῖν.
[4] Matt. x. 28.
[5] Matt. x. 29.
[6] John xii. 25.
[7] See Job ii. 21; vi. 15, 16. Jerem. viii. 3.
[8] Joel ii. 4, 5.
[9] Verse 9.
[1] Called in Italian, *cavalette.*

mans are nations of horsemen. The fury of the charge of the Moslem cavalry, and of their riders brandishing their scimitars with wonderful dexterity, and rushing to the conflict with the terrible war-cry, "*Allah! Allah!*" are well known.

"And on their heads," it is said in this prophecy, "there are *as it were* crowns *like gold*, and their *faces as the faces of men*, and their *hair as the hair of women, and their teeth as the teeth of lions.*" The word for crown here is στέφανος, a crown of victory;[2] and they are contrasted here with those holy persons in the Apocalypse who are represented in the fourth chapter, the fourth verse, as *wearing golden crowns of victory*. That is, the crowns of these fierce Mohammedan warriors are not real crowns, nor are they in truth of gold; they have only a splendid semblance of glory and triumph, compared with the genuine lustre and true victory of the saints of God.[3]

Their faces also are represented as *the faces of men, their hair as the hair of women;* and this is also characteristic of the Saracens. Some (as Isaac Williams in his Exposition of the Apocalypse, p. 149) regard this as a representation of the union of luxurious sensuality and savage cruelty in the Mohammedan character. But it may also have a literal meaning. The hair of Mohammed hung in long tresses over his shoulders, and retained its dark colour to the day of his death;[4] and the Arabians and Saracens are described as wearing their hair long and flowing, and sometimes plaited like women.[5] And the prophecy also says, that though they

[2] On the gold-embroidered *uskiuf* of Ottoman warriors, see *D'Ohsson*, Tableau de l'Empire Othoman, iv. 114.

[3] This is well expressed by *Haymo* in his Exposition of the Apocalypse, who says, "The elders in the fourth chapter have golden crowns on their heads, signifying their triumphant victory; but these evil warriors have not real crowns, but only certain figures of crowns; nor are these figures of crowns really gold, but only like gold, counterfeits of what is true." And so *Arethas* on the Apocalypse.

[4] *Dr. J. M. Arnold*, Islam, p. 65. *Sir W. Muir*, Life of Mohammed, p. 345, and so Abas, his uncle, see *D'Ohsson*, iv. 125.

[5] *Plin.* Nat Hist. vi. 33. *Ammian. Marcellin.* xiv. 4; xxxi. 16, where *Valesius* says, "Such was the costume of the Saracens, wearing their hair long and braided, hanging down on their backs, 'crinitis vittatisque capitibus,'" in the words of *S. Jerome*, de Vita Malchi, tom. iv.

have faces like men and hair like women, and have therefore a semblance of effeminacy and gentleness, yet their wrath is terrible; they not only sweep over the earth like locusts, and sting like scorpions, but they devour "with the teeth of lions." This has been verified in the sanguinary carnage and ferocious outrages perpetrated by the armies of Islam for twelve hundred years in Christendom, and recently in our own age.

In the tenth verse of this prophecy, this power, which has been compared to locusts and horses, is said to have "tails like scorpions, and there are stings in its tails." It may be thought fanciful to observe that the emblems of power in the standards of the Moslem army are horse-tails[6] plaited together and mounted on a pike. I do not lay stress upon this; but how often has the sight of it pierced the hearts of Christians with fear and anguish, and how often has the exercise of that savage power stung them with agony and death as with the sting of scorpions!

And now what follows? St. John says that they have power to hurt men *five months*. This is said by him twice.[7] What does this mean? It has been observed by naturalists that locusts come forth in the spring and disappear in the autumn, when they are made torpid by cold.[8] They prevail for *five months*, from April to September, and their ravages are confined within these limits of time. The meaning, therefore, may be, that as the action of natural locusts is restrained by God, so it will be also with these typical locusts of Islam. They will ravage the earth for a time, predetermined by God; but the day will come when they will be benumbed and frozen, perhaps by some cold blast from the north.[9] But this is certain that in God's own time

pt. ii. p. 92. *D'Ohsson* says, iv. 126, that though the Turks despise what is womanlike, yet in order to preserve the usage of the Saracens, and the practice of Mohammed and his disciples, and though they shave their heads, they take care to leave on the crown of the head, like the Chinese, "une espèce de toupet, que l'on noue, et que l'on cache sous le turban."

[6] Called *Toughs*. *Thornton*, Present State of Turkey, i. 267—269; *D'Herbelot*, Biblioth. Orientale, i. 199.

[7] Verses 5, 10. [8] *Bochart*, Hierozoic, iv. c. 8, p. 495.

[9] This is the exposition given by some ancient interpreters, as in the Catena on the Apocalypse, p. 527, ed. Cramer.

they will have an end, and this is surely worth noting; for Mohammedanism proclaims itself to be the only true faith, and the only permanent religion; it professes in the Koran that it was delivered by God through the Angel Gabriel, to Mohammed, after the revelations given by Moses and Jesus Christ, Whom it ventures to eulogize, and yet dares to misrepresent, and Whose revelations it presumes to say have been now superseded by itself. Mohammedanism claims to be universal and eternal. It was indeed due (as the prophecy declares) to a fallen star who *had the key of the abyss* and let it loose; but it boasts that it alone has the *key of paradise and heaven;* it tramples under foot and would stamp to powder all other creeds. It would make all men —yes, all Prophets and Apostles and Evangelists, and even Christ Himself—to bow down before it, and would reign supreme and alone in the world. Assuredly, then, it was worth saying that its sway is limited; and that, whereas, as St. John declares in the Apocalypse,[1] "the *Gospel is everlasting,*" and as our Lord declares, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but His words shall *never pass away,*"[2] the dominion of Mohammedanism will *pass away;* it will be comparatively of short duration, only as it were *for five months,* like that of the swarms of real locusts, which appear and ravage the earth for a time, and are then swept away by the wind into the sea.[3]

But perhaps something else may be discovered here in this term of *five months.* The *month* is measured by the changes of the *moon;* the *crescent moon* is the symbol of Islam. Some have said that it was adopted from the ancient Byzantium, in 1453, when it was taken by the Turks; but it seems to have been borne on the Moslem escutcheon before that time.[4] Perhaps, then, it may be conjectured

[1] Rev. xiv. 6.

[2] Matt. v. 35.

[3] Cp. Joel ii. 20; Exod. x. 19.

[4] *Dean Milman* speaks of it as such, Latin Christianity, book iv. chap. ii. pp. 220, 223, ed. 1872; and so *Dr. I. M. Arnold,* Islam, p. 179; *Mr. Hallam,* chap. vi.; and see *Mr. Arthur J. Evans,* Tour through Bosnia, 1876, p. 219, who says, "The Osmanlis must have borrowed the device from their Saracenic predecessors."

that a *month* here represents the duration of a Moslem dynasty, and *five months* may perhaps mean *five dynasties*. And when we come to examine the succession of Islam dynasties, as traced by the most accredited authors, from the time of Mohammed to the present day, we find that they are *five*. We are now living in the fifth dynasty; it may be the last.[5]

The first dynasty consisted of four Caliphs, successors of Mohammed at Medina, who were elective; the second dynasty was that of the Ommiades at Damascus, who were hereditary; the third was that of the Abbassides at Bagdad; the fourth was that at Cairo,[6] in Egypt; the fifth was that of the Ottomans, who now rule at Constantinople.

It is further added in this prophecy, that these "locusts *have a king* over them." Their form of government is *monarchical*. This is very remarkable. For it is expressly specified in Scripture as a characteristic of *natural locusts* that "they have *no king*." "The locusts," says Solomon, "have *no king*; yet go they forth in bands."[7] Again, therefore, we see that these locusts of the Apocalypse are not natural, but typical. They *have a king*. Now, it is observable, that *for twelve hundred and sixty years the Mohammedans have always had a king*. They have had changes of dynasties, as we have seen; their caliphs have been murdered, have committed suicide, have been deposed, and been succeeded by infants or idiots. This continuance of a *Monarchy* among them is more singular, because since the Crescent passed to the dynasty of the Ottoman Turks at the close of the thirteenth century, the sovereign is not a *caliph*,

[5] Let me refer to the valuable work of *M. D'Ohsson*, who was a native of Constantinople, and writes from intimate knowledge of the history of the Ottoman empire, in his Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman, tom. i. p. 231, Paris, 1778; see also *D'Herbelot*, Bibliothèque Orientale, tom. i. pp. 4, 499; *Hallam*, ii. chap. vi. p. 581.

[6] The Fatimites, of which *Gibbon* says, chap. lvii. p. 1061, ed. London, 1830, "The revolution which transferred the sceptre from the Abbassides (of Bagdad) to the Fatimites (in Egypt), was a benefit rather than an injury to the Holy Land;" but it was recovered by the Abbassides. See *Gibbon*, chap. lix. p. 1097; and *D'Ohsson*, i. p. 232; and *D'Herbelot*, p. 4. The Ottoman dynasty dates from A.D. 1289; ibid. ii. p. 209.

[7] Prov. xxx. 27.

i. e. a *successor* of Mohammed, except by a legal fiction. As the historian Gibbon observes,[8] "the *Ottomans* (or Turks) cannot style themselves, like the Arabian caliphs, the descendants or successors of the (so-called) apostle of God (Mohammed); but their sacred and indefeasible right was soon and unalterably implanted in the minds of their subjects. A weak or vicious sultan may be deposed and strangled, but his inheritance devolves to an infant or an idiot; nor has the most daring rebel presumed to ascend the throne of his lawful sovereign. While the foremost dynasties of Asia have been continually subverted by a crafty vizier in the palace, or by a successful general in the camp, the *Ottoman succession* has been confirmed by the practice of five centuries, and is incorporated with the *vital principle of the Turkish nation.*" The Mohammedans have had innumerable revolutions in these twelve centuries, since the time of Mohammed, but they have never had a republic; they have never had an aristocracy; they have never had an oligarchy; they have *always had a king;* they have always had a *caliph* —which (as I have said) means *successor*—successor of their Prophet Mohammed, and now also called *Sultan,* or Lord. Thus the prophecy has been fulfilled.

What else does this prophecy say? It declares that, though they shall ever have a king, though a Monarchy is guaranteed to them as long as they exist, yet their king is not what kings ought to be, a father of his country, a parent of his people. No; his name is declared here by St. John to be *destroyer,* "in the Hebrew tongue, *Abaddon,* and in the Greek, *Apollyon;*" so that Jew and Gentile, that is, the whole world, may read his title written by the hand of God as *destroyer, exterminator of men.*[9]

What shall we say here? Mohammed represented himself as the *apostle* of God and *saviour,* sent by Him to preach the truth, and to declare the way of *salvation.* All, he says, are doomed to destruction who do not hearken unto me, and who do not receive the revelation of the Koran as the final

[8] Chap. lxv. p. 1193.

[9] In the Vulgate translation of the Apocalypse the word here is *Exterminans,* in the Arabic Version it is *Shedder of blood.*

revelation of God. But while he thus proclaims himself the apostle and saviour of mankind, he denies in that book the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity;[1] he does despite to that only Name given unto men whereby they may be saved,[2] the Name of Christ; he denies Christ's Godhead;[3] he rejects Christ's Divine Sonship;[4] he rejects that in which the Apostle gloried, namely, the Cross of Christ; and he affirms, with some blasphemers of old, preaching the doctrine of antichrist, that Jesus was not crucified for us,[5] but that another suffered in his stead. And thus he by these deadly doctrines, may be said to appropriate to himself the name of *Destroyer* and *Exterminator* in that book, the Koran, which he has delivered to be read[6] and revered by all.

He does it also in express terms. Hear his own words, written in the Koran. In chapter iv. he says, "Fight for the religion of God. Excite the faithful to war." In the next chapter, "O true believers, take not the Jews or Christians for your friends. Whoso among you taketh them for his friends, he is surely one of them. God will love those who are humble towards the believers, and are severe to the unbelievers." And in chapter viii. God is introduced as saying, "I will cast a dread into the hearts of the unbelievers" (that is, all who are not Mohammedans); "*therefore, strike off their heads, and strike off all the ends of their fingers.* This shall they suffer, because they have resisted God and His apostle (Mohammed); and whosoever shall oppose God and His apostle, verily God will be severe in punishing him." And again, chapter ix., "*Fight against them who believe not in God,* and profess not the true religion." And in the same chapter he promises infinite felicity in paradise to those who wage war against the unbelievers; and he ends the chapter with these words: "O true believers, *wage war against such of the unbelievers as are near you,* and let them find severity in you, and know that God is with those who fear Him." And again, in

[1] Koran, chaps. iv. v.
[2] Acts iv. 12.
[3] Koran, chap. v.
[4] Ibid. chaps. iv. ix.
[5] Ibid. chaps. iii. iv.
[6] The word Koran signifies *what is read.*

chapter xlvii., he says, "When ye encounter the unbelievers, *strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter among them; He commandeth you to fight His battles, which if ye do, He will lead you into paradise, of which He hath told you.*" And then he describes, in glowing language, the joys of paradise;[7] and concludes the chapter with repeating the command, and asks of his followers a question, doubtless in the hearts of many among them at this time: "Hath not a *Sura*[8] been revealed *commanding war against the infidels?* and when the command is firmly established, if the believers give credit unto God, it will be better for them. Were ye, therefore, ready, if ye had been put in authority, *to commit outrages in the earth, and to violate the ties of blood?*" And he denounces vengeance against those who do not fulfil the command: "O true believers," he exclaims, "obey God, and obey His apostle, and render not your works of no effect. Faint not, therefore, *neither invite your enemies to peace, while ye are the superior;* for God is with you, and will not defraud you of the merit of your works."

May we not therefore say that the Koran is written in blood? and that Mohammed, who requires all to accept that book as the final revelation from God, superseding the Law of Moses and the Gospel of Christ, does by that very command claim for himself and for his successors, who obey its precepts, the title written by God's hand, to be recognized of all, *Abaddon* and *Apollyon* (that is, the *destroyer*)?

When also we trace the effects of this teaching in the history of Islamism for more than twelve hundred years, we see that that history also is written in characters of blood. Let me cite the words of an author already quoted, M. D'Ohsson,[9] who, having passed in review the acts of the several caliphs, sums up his narrative as follows: "Thus we see, since the establishment of Mohammedanism, the entire East presents only a theatre of carnage and of horror, under almost all these caliphs, who made rivers of blood to flow over these vast and miserable countries" (i. 245).

[7] See also chaps. lv. lvi. for a description of the joys of paradise.

[8] I. e. a *chapter* of the Koran; see *Sale*, Koran, chap. ix.

[9] Cp. *Dr. T. P. Hughes'* learned "Notes on Mohammedism," 1877 (Pref.).

It is also worthy of note, what is remarked by an apologist of Islamism, Mr. Thornton,[1] that the Turkish Sultan has two official titles, among others; one, *Zil-ullah* (or shadow of God), the other *Hunkiar*,[2] which signifies *man-slayer*; almost identical with the words *Abaddon* and *Apollyon* in the Apocalypse. Mr. Thornton illustrates this by saying that "the Sultan may lawfully kill fourteen persons a day without assigning a cause;" and that "inasmuch as he is supposed to be invested with official holiness, as supreme pontiff (*Caliph* and *Imâm*) of the nation, as well as sovereign lord (*Sultân*), even though he should order the execution of a thousand men a day, he is held irresponsible for the act."[3]

But, after all, their cruelty to the *bodies of* men is even exceeded by that fiend-like ferocity which wars against the *soul*. It is here also that Mohammed and his successors have identified themselves with the *Abaddon* and the *Apollyon* of the Apocalypse. They have done the work of the Evil One by taking up arms against Christ. They know Christ and blaspheme Him. While Christ says, "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life, but the wrath of God abideth on him;"[4] they, with the Gospel in their hands and professing to revere it, deny His divine Sonship and His life-giving Passion, and, if they were able, they would erase the Cross from the forehead of Christendom, and would fight against Christ by means of Christians themselves.

Let us here refer to the history of the Janissaries. About five centuries ago, as the historian Gibbon relates,[5] in the

[1] *Mr. Thornton*, in his History of the Turkish Empire, vol. i. p. 112, and *Dr. I. M. Arnold's* Islam, p. 216, 3rd ed. 1874.

[2] Professor Cowell, of Cambridge, informs me that "*Hunkar* is a colloquial Persian expression for the Sultan of Turkey," and Professor Gandell, of Oxford, has referred me to Richardson's Persian Dictionary, where the word "*Hunkar*" is thus explained—"a Killer, a King, as having the power of life and death, hence used as a title of the Grand Turk."

[3] Compare the records of Mohammedan ferocity in *Mr. Eton's* Survey of the Turkish Empire, 4th ed. London, 1809, p. 18; and see pp. 135—147, where is a sketch of Turkish history.

[4] John iii. 36. 1 John v. 12.

[5] *Gibbon*, chap. lxiv. p. 1175.

days of Amurath the First, the Turks marched against the Sclavonian nations between the Danube and the Adriatic, especially the Bulgarians and Servians, and having overrun those countries (to cite his words), "the Sultan was reminded that according to the Mohammedan law he was entitled to a fifth part of the spoil and captives, and he selected for his use the stoutest and most beautiful of the *Christian* youth, and many thousands of these *Christian* captives were *forced to apostatize*, and were trained in the Turkish religion and arms, and were consecrated and named by a celebrated Dervish, *Janissaries*, or *new soldiers*" (such is the meaning of the word); "and having been so trained they fought with the zeal of proselytes *against their own countrymen*, and in the battle of Cossova the league and independence of the Sclavonian tribes was finally crushed." After that victory, Amurath himself was slain by one of these Servian soldiers; but, as Gibbon[6] states in another place, after his death "the provinces of Thrace, Macedonia, Albania, Bulgaria, and Servia" (those countries which have lately risen up in revolt against the Ottoman power) "became the perpetual seminary of the Turkish army; and when the royal fifth of the captives was diminished by conquest, an inhuman tax of the fifth child, or of every fifth year, was vigorously levied on the Christian families. At the age of twelve or fourteen years the most robust youths were torn from their parents, their names were enrolled in a book, and from that moment they were clothed, taught, and maintained for the public service by military exercises, and were drafted into the companies of the Janissaries."[7]

The blood of their souls cries from the ground in Servia and Bulgaria, and mingles its voice with that of their countrymen who have recently been slain by the sword of Islam.

"It would be impossible," (says Isaac Williams on the Apocalypse, p. 152), "for any human writer to describe the character, rise, and spread of this terrible Apostasy in the

[6] Chap. lxv. p. 1193.

[7] See also *Eton*, Turkish Empire, pp. 58 and 136; and *Hallam*, Middle Ages, ii. 196.

allegorical language of Eastern poetry with more force of imagery, aptness of delineation, and depth of colouring, than it has been prophetically depicted in this chapter of the Book of Revelation. Such is Mohammedanism when contemplated in the mirror of Holy Scripture. It arises in a foul *smoke from the bottomless pit*, its effect on the soul the undying worm, and itself is the work of the *destroyer*."

But a more joyful sound is now heard. Look again at the prophecy in the Apocalypse. The divine seer, St. John, foresees and foretells the downfall of this terrible power: he says, "*One woe is past*," or, literally, "*the first woe passed away*"[8] (ἀπῆλθεν). St. John calls Mohammedanism *a woe;* and he describes its disappearance as sudden. This is probable from the character of Islamism. It is founded on the doctrine of *fatalism:* and this doctrine produces two opposite results—presumption and despair. As long as Mohammedanism is victorious, it is fierce and almost irresistible; but when it receives a check, it is stunned and paralyzed, and sinks into despondency.[9] The name *Moslem* signifies one who is *resigned* to his destiny. *Islamism* means *resignation*. This fatalism is consecrated by certain words which are ever in the hearts and on the lips of true Mussulmans,[1] *takdir* or *kismet*.

The prophecy seems to foretell by the word used (Rev. ix. 12) that Mohammedanism will *pass away*, not so much by violent destruction from without, but by an internal collapse, like the flowing away of a stream.

Circumstances seem to intimate this. A little more than fifty years ago, the armed forces of Egypt, under Mehemet Ali and Ibrahim Pasha rushed to the standard of the Sultan, and crushed the insurrection in Greece. But now Egypt is still, and she recently gazed with indifference and complacency on the ebbing stream of evanescent Islamism. Again, about a quarter of a century ago some of the greatest

[8] ἀπῆλθεν—aorist. Rev. ix. 12.

[9] There is a remarkable passage in *D'Ohsson*, Empire Othoman, i. p. 168, showing the effect of this belief in predestination not only on individuals, but on the public policy of the Ottomans.

[1] D'Ohsson, p. 170.

Nations of Europe, England being one, combined in favour of Turkey, and expended immense treasure and some of their best life-blood in the Crimea in defence of the Empire of the Crescent, and for the maintenance of its integrity. But now at a recent treaty, that of Berlin, the belligerent parties on both sides have joined together in the dismemberment of that Empire.

Again, not many years ago, it was confidently affirmed, that if the Empire of the Sultan was impaired by England the Mohammedans of India would arise in insurrection against us. But this apprehension has proved groundless. We ourselves are taking up arms against a Mohammedan power in Afghanistan, and Indian Mohammedanism is calm.

But most of all, the inveterate internal corruption of the whole Turkish Empire, and the utter hopelessness of its recovery, seem to show that the prophecy of the Apocalypse will be fulfilled at no distant time, and that, by a process of intestine decay, disorganization, and dissolution, the power of Mohammedanism will *pass away*.[2]

Let me now offer some practical reflections.

The history of Mohammedanism (as foreshadowed by St. John in the Apocalypse) shows in a strong light the evil effects of heresy, schism, and corrupt worship in the Church. Islamism owes its origin and power to them.

Here then is a warning to ourselves. Let us shun heresy, schism, and corrupt worship, and let us resolve by God's grace to hold firmly the true faith, to adore Him in purity and holiness, and to dwell together in unity.

Next, the strength of Mohammedanism arose from those principles of good which it has in the midst of evil. It has faith in the Divine omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience; and it has acted energetically on that faith. And in this respect it is an example to Christian nations who enjoy the blessings of a purer revelation.

[2] As to the probability of an external shock from the North, see *Gibbon*, chap. lv. *Rycaut*, State of the Greek Church, p. 83. *Walsh*, Journey from Constantinople, p. 436, ed. Dublin, 1854. *Eton*, Turkish Empire, p. 193. *Döllinger*, Mohammed's Religion, p. 146. *Dr. J. H. Newman*, "Lectures on the History of the Turks," p. 272.

The reverence and devotion of the Mussulman is, in many respects, a pattern to us, especially with regard to prayer. In the grey twilight of the morning the muezzin mounts the minaret of the mosques in the cities of the Turkish empire, and with a clear harmonious voice he calls aloud, "Prayer is better than sleep; come to the Temple of Salvation."[3] The sound is repeated five times every day. Mohammedans are a people of prayer. As soon as the hour arrives, they repair to the mosque, or rehearse the prayers in private. Business is suspended at the time. The merchant in the bazaar, the traveller in his journey, the mariner at sea, the artisan and husbandman in their toil, are seen in an attitude of devotion. They are not ashamed to pray. Together with their stated prayers, they recite words from the Koran, which they believe to have come from heaven.

They never engage in battle without prayer for success; and they never gain a victory without thanking God.[4]

It would be a happy thing if Englishmen had the same reverence for the Bible that Mussulmans have for the Koran; and that the spirit of prayer prevailed with us as with them, and that we had the same faith in its efficacy, and declared our faith as they do.

And how blessed is the thought, that if, in answer to our prayers, and as a result of our Christian example, and of our missionary enterprise, it should please God in His infinite goodness to touch the hearts of Mohammedans, and if they should turn from the false prophet to the True, from Mohammed to Christ, from the Koran to the Bible, glorious would be the consequences. It would be the emancipation of Womanhood in a large part of the world. The conversion of Mohammedans to Christianity would be a reply to the scepticism of the age, and a new proof of the Divine origin of the Gospel. And not only so, but the accession of their energy, and of their reverential and religious spirit, and of their dutiful obedience, would infuse new life into our languid

[3] See the interesting account given of the "canonical hours" and religious practices of Islamism in these respects by *D'Ohsson*, ii. pp. 99, 109—112, 163—166.

[4] See *D'Ohsson*, ii. 253—256, and p. 262.

Christianity, and would kindle throughout Christendom a new flame of devotion. And when the hindrances of Islamism are removed, we might hope that, with the blessing of God, the ancient Churches of the East would revive in a second spring, and be restored in primitive faith and purity.

Then at Constantinople, and in other great cities of the East, where the Crescent now gleams, the Cross of Christ would once more reign supreme. St. Sophia might again become a Christian Church. We might again see Apostolic bishops like Ignatius and Polycarp in the Asiatic Churches of St. John; and a Cyprian, an Athanasius, a Cyril, and an Augustine in the cities of Africa; a Gregory Nazianzen and a Chrysostom at Constantinople; and we might be joined with them, and they be united with us, in praising one God and Saviour, as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all.[5]

The recent acquisition of the island of Cyprus by England seems to be a providential opening for intercourse of the Anglican Churches with the Churches of the East,[6] and for the revival of Christianity in those countries which were its heritage of old, and for the conversion of the votaries of Islam to faith in Christ.

Let us, therefore, pray for that blessed consummation. "O merciful God, Who hast made all men, and hatest nothing that Thou hast made, nor wouldest the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics, and take from them all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of Thy Word; and so fetch them home, blessed Lord, to Thy flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one fold under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen."

[5] Gal. iv. 26.

[6] The recent fraternal interchange of kindly offices between the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Arch-Bishop and Clergy of Cyprus is a happy augury of future blessings.

THE DECLINE OF MOHAMMEDANISM

A SIGNAL FOR THE GREATER SPREAD OF THE *GOSPEL*, WHICH WILL BE TO SOME A *WOE*.

The decline of the Mohammedan Power (which was the subject of the foregoing paper), will, it is probable, be coincident in time with a great extension of Christianity, and will conduce to it.

Recent events in Eastern Europe and Asia—the acquisition of the island of Cyprus by England, opening the East to Christian Missions—the military successes of her forces in North-Western India, against a Mohammedan power—all these seem to point in the same direction. It is remarkable that the passing away of Mohammedanism is connected in the prophecies of the Apocalypse (in the same chapter, the ninth), with the spread of the Gospel, which is there represented as following it.

The former of these subjects occupies the first twelve verses; the latter is described in the remainder of that chapter.

Both these topics are now deservedly arresting public attention, and it may be profitable to examine those prophecies consecutively in reference to them.

Having considered the former prophecy in the foregoing pages, I will now proceed to the examination of the latter.

Rev. ix. 13—15, "And the sixth Angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth Angel which had the Trumpet, Loose the Four Angels which are bound (have been bound) in the great river Euphrates. And the Four Angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour (*the*

hour) and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men."

In this Book, the Book of Revelation, Seven Angels have been introduced in succession, each sounding a Trumpet. These Seven Trumpets announce successive divine judgments; and they end with the seventh or Last Trumpet, which will awaken the dead from their graves, and will summon the world to the Judgment-Seat of Christ.

The *last three* of these *seven* trumpets are called in this book *Woe-Trumpets*, because they proclaim three judicial *Woes*, with which God will visit those who do not believe and obey the Gospel.

In the former part of this ninth chapter, the fifth Angel sounds the fifth Trumpet, which is the first of these three Woe Trumpets.

The Woe announced by that Trumpet (as has been shown in the previous paper) was Mohammedanism. After describing the ravages perpetrated by it, the prophecy foretells that in God's time it will *pass away*.

Then the sixth Angel is introduced sounding the sixth Trumpet.

This is the subject before us.

"The sixth Angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God, saying to the sixth Angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four Angels which have been bound in (*or* at) the great river Euphrates."

The voice proceeds from the four horns of the golden altar, the altar of incense (the type of prayer), which is before God. Therefore this is a divine voice, and is an answer to prayer.

This has been observed by ancient Expositors.[1] And this preamble is tantamount to a declaration that what is here done in obedience to this Voice from the holy altar is done by the *command of God* and *cannot* be an *evil* act.

The Divine Voice says to the sixth Angel, "Loose the four Angels which have been bound at the great river Euphrates."

What are these Angels?

[1] See Isaac Williams on the Apocalypse, p. 162, ed. 1875.

The word *Angel* means *messenger*, and *Evangelium* or Gospel means a *good message*, a message of God; and wherever the word Angel is introduced in Scripture, absolutely, as here, without any epithet, it signifies a *good* Angel, an Angel *of God*.[2] The voice from the golden altar is a divine voice, it speaks to an Angel who is a divine messenger of God, and commands him to loose the four Angels who are also messengers of God. Therefore the act here done is an *act of God*, working by His own agents. This was the opinion of ancient authors, mentioned by one of the most learned Greek Expositors, Andreas,[3] who wrote in the sixth or seventh century.

Observe also these holy Angels or Messengers who are loosed are *four*. In the Apocalypse the number *four* symbolizes Universality of space, and is applied to the *four Gospels* (*Evangelia*), which are called the *four living creatures* in the fourth chapter,[4] and represent the living power of *Evangelical* preaching to the *four quarters* of the Globe. In the seventh chapter we see in like manner *four Angels* (vii. 1, 2), and these are clearly Angels *of God*. The prophecy therefore before us foretells that the decline of the Mohammedan power will be followed by the loosing of four heavenly Messengers; in other words that it will be a signal for a diffusion of the Gospel throughout the world.

This is also revealed in another passage of the Book of Revelation which speaks of the signs of the latter days, and illustrates the present prophecy. "I saw," says St. John (Rev. xiv. 6), "*an Angel* flying in the midst of heaven, having the *Everlasting Gospel* (*Evangelium*) to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, saying, Fear God, for *the hour* of His judgment is come;" an expression, be it observed, which explains the words in the present prophecy, viz. "that the *four angels* have been *prepared* for *the hour*" (such is the true translation), "and for the day," that is for the Day *of Judg-*

[2] This has been well observed here by Dr. Hengstenberg.

[3] Andreas, and after him Arethas and Œcumenius. See Dr. Cramer's Catena on the Apocalypse, p. 321, 528.

[4] May I refer to my notes on Rev. iv. 6?

ment. As our Lord says "*The word* which I have spoken unto you, that shall *judge* you at the *last day*" (John xii. 48).

In the prophecy before us the Four Angels are described as having *been bound* at the great river *Euphrates.*

What does this mean?

Many modern Expositors, deviating from the ancient interpretation,[5] and marring the analogy of language in this wonderful book (which is composed with perfect accuracy and exquisite precision) imagine that the word *Euphrates* is here used *literally,* and signifies the Eastern river bearing that name.

And yet—which is strange—the same Expositors rightly say that the word *Babylon* (whose river the Euphrates was), which is used six times in this book, is *never* used in a *literal* sense. *If* the word Euphrates is to be understood in this book *literally,* and signifies the Eastern river, then the word *Babylon,* which was on the river Euphrates, is also to be understood *literally,* and means the Eastern, Assyrian, city. But this is impossible; and these Expositors own it to be out of the question. And they truly say that the word *Babylon* in the Apocalypse is to be understood *spiritually,* and means the *City and* Church *of Rome;* as we have already seen to be the case.[6] But if the word *Babylon* is to be understood spiritually (as is certain), then the word *Euphrates,* which was the river of Babylon, is no less surely to be understood spiritually also.

And further, on principles of analogy, the word Euphrates here represents something which bears the same relation to the spiritual Babylon (i. e. to the Church of Rome) as the literal river Euphrates bore to the literal Babylon.

The literal Euphrates was the cause of the strength and the channel of the commerce and wealth of the literal Babylon.[7]

[5] No ancient Expositors (such as Andreas, Arethas, Œcumenius among the Greeks, or such as Tychonius, Bede, Haymo, Ambrosius Ansbertus among the Latins) interpret *Euphrates* literally. They suppose it to mean the power of the spiritual Babylon.

[6] Vol. i. p. 362—413, where the meaning of the name *Babylon* in the Apocalypse is fully discussed.

[7] See above, i. 437.

And what, let us ask, has been the cause of power and wealth to the spiritual Babylon?

It is its Papal Supremacy. That Supremacy has been flowing onward in a strong, deep, and wide flood for many centuries, and has been the means of the wealth and aggrandisement of the Spiritual Babylon.[8]

But what (it may be asked) is the meaning of the Four Angels *having been bound* at this river of the Papal Euphrates, and being now loosed?

The answer is easy. For many centuries the Gospel has been bound as a captive at Rome. As Israel of old was bound as a captive at the literal Euphrates, the waters of Babylon, and hung up its harp on the willows there,[9] so the Christian Church, with the Scriptures in her hands, has been bound as a captive on the banks of the Papal Babylon. Do you ask a proof of this? Take one or two out of many. Although Rome calls herself the Holy City, the Centre of Unity, "the Mother and Mistress of all Churches," and although it is the special duty of a Church to diffuse God's Word, yet not a single copy of the original Hebrew of the Old Testament has ever been printed in the city of Rome; and not a single copy of the Greek original of the New Testament was printed in the city of Rome for four centuries and more after the invention of Printing. Both Testaments were kept bound in prison at the Euphrates of the Papal Babylon. It is doubtful whether a single copy of any *Translation* of the Holy Scriptures into any modern language has ever issued from the Papal Press in the City of Rome. By the fourth rule of the Roman "Index Expurgatorius," the liberty to read the Bible is flatly denied to all except under very strict conditions which almost amount to a prohibition.[1] And the Papal Bull *Unigenitus* (A.D. 1713) condemned the proposition "that the Holy Scriptures were written for all, and ought to be read by all."

[8] The word *Euphrates* has the same spiritual meaning in another passage of the Apocalypse. Rev. xvi. 12. May I again refer to my notes in proof of this?

[9] See Psalm cxxxvii. 1—8.

[1] Regulæ Indicis SS. Synodi Tridentinæ jussu editæ.

Thus the four Angels have been bound as prisoners at the great river, the Papal Euphrates.

Thus also Papal Rome has dealt worse with God's Word than *Pagan* Rome did. Though Pagan Rome bound the Apostles, it placed no restrictions on the circulation of their Epistles or Gospels, so that St. Paul writing from Rome itself was able to say "the Word of God has *not been bound*" (2 Tim. ii. 9).

By the good Providence of God a greater freedom is now about to be given to the circulation of the Scriptures, by the passing away of the Mohammedan Power in the East. For, let us remember that wherever the Moslem rule is dominant no Church of Christ is permitted to be built.[2] And by a remarkable coincidence a similar emancipation has by God's mercy been effected for His Word in the West, especially at Rome. Since the taking of Rome by the forces of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy, on Sept. 20, 1870, and the weakening of the temporal power of Rome, Bibles in the vernacular tongue may now be freely circulated in that country. Truly we may say that the four Angels, which for many centuries had been bound as captives at the river Euphrates, have now been loosed.

Here, however, it may be said, Be it so, but is not the free circulation of God's Word an inestimable *blessing?* How is this reconcilable, with the name given to the sixth trumpet in the chapter before, which is called a Trumpet of *Woe?* The answer to this question is; Every gift of God, which is a blessing to those who thankfully receive it, is also a *woe* to *those who reject it.* And the greater the blessing is to the one, the greater the woe is to the other.

Observe that these last Trumpets are introduced with the solemn preamble, "*Woe, Woe, Woe to the inhabiters of the earth!*" (Rev. viii. 13.) Remark those words, "the inhabiters of the earth," (this is the phrase in the Apocalypse for *worldly men;* those who are "of the earth earthy," those who have not their "conversation in heaven," Phil. iii. 20);

[2] The Hidayah declares "The construction of churches in Muslim territory is unlawful." See the interesting and instructive work, by the Rev. Dr. T. P. Hughes, Notes on Mohammedanism, p. 210, 2nd ed. 1877.

"by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three Angels, which are yet to sound."

Observe also that in this Book the Seventh Trumpet, which announces the Resurrection of the Dead and the future Judgment, is called a *Woe*, the third *Woe*. And yet what greater *blessing* can be imagined to the righteous than the Resurrection of their bodies from their graves? It will be the consummation of their bliss, and bring them to everlasting life and glory in heaven. But it will be a terrible *Woe* to the Wicked. It speaks of "Come, ye blessed" to the one, but it speaks also of "Depart from Me, *ye cursed*," to the other. And therefore the sounding of the Seventh Trumpet, the Trumpet of Resurrection and Judgment, is called the third or last *Woe*. Indeed the characteristic attribute of all the Trumpets of the Apocalypse is that they warn a careless and godless world of the punitive character of God's visitations.

But it may be said, that the figurative imagery of this present prophecy is too terrible to be applicable to Holy Scripture. It displays to us the four Angels as having an enormous army, two hundred millions of horses, and horsemen riding upon them, clad in breastplates of fire and jacinth and brimstone; and the heads of the horses are as the heads of lions, and out of their mouths issue fire and smoke and brimstone; and by these three plagues[3] the third part of men is killed, literally the third part of *the* men (the *worldlings* who are the subject of the prophecy) is killed by the fire and smoke and brimstone which issue out of their mouths, for their power is in their mouth and in their tails, for their tails are like unto serpents, and they have heads, and with them they do hurt.

Can this be applicable to Holy Scripture?

To this question it may be replied, that this imagery, which at first may stagger us, does in fact prove that the interpretation, which has now been given, is the true one. It may be taken as a general rule, that there is scarcely a difficult passage in the Apocalypse which is not made easy by some other place in the same book; and that there is hardly an

[3] This is the reading of the best manuscripts.

obscure passage in the Apocalypse which is not made clear by some other place in it.

Observe, first, that these horsemen led by the Four Angels are said to *hurt*, i. e. to punish the wicked; but this is also said of the Four Angels, who are *God's* angels in the seventh chapter; to them "it is given to *hurt* the earth," that is, earthly-minded men (Rev. vii. 1, 2).

Observe, secondly, that this prophecy of the sixth trumpet is called the *Second Woe*. And now if we turn to *another* passage in this same book, the *eleventh* chapter, we find that the vision which is revealed there, is also called the *Second Woe* (ver. 14). In that eleventh chapter we have a *parallel vision;* and that parallel vision explains the *present one*.

These parallels are of great use in the Apocalypse, like the parallels in the Book of Daniel; for example, the fourfold image in the second chapter of Daniel representing the same thing (with different features) as the four beasts in the seventh chapter of the same book.

So in the Apocalypse we have two parallel visions, each of which is called the *Second Woe;* see xi. 14, compared with ix. 12, 13, which speaks of the passing away of the first Woe and the succession of the second Woe.

In one of these two parallel visions (that in the eleventh chapter) the vision of the *Two Witnesses*, which are clearly *God's* Witnesses, and which probably represent the Two Testaments,[4] and at any rate display the power of the preaching of *God's Word*, we read that out of their *mouth* (i. e. out of the mouth of the Witnesses) *proceedeth fire and devoureth their enemies*, and these two prophets *tormented* them that dwell on the earth, *and they have power to smite* the *earth* with all *plagues*, and if any man will hurt them he must in this manner be *killed*.

This imagery is very like that of the horses in the army of the four Angels in the vision before us; and shows that we ought not to be surprised that the power and work of God's Word should be described by terrible imagery of fire and smoke and brimstone devouring its enemies, in the prophecy before us.

[4] May I refer to my Commentary on Rev. xi.?

Is it wonderful, that the preaching of God's Word to those who will not receive it should be called a *Woe?* This is the language which Christ Himself used concerning His own Word, when He began to upbraid the cities to which He had preached, and which did not repent (Matt. xi. 20). "*Woe* unto thee, Chorazin!" (He said) "*Woe* unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you." And *eight times* He denounced *Woe* on those who would not hearken to Him (Matt. xxii. 13—39). "Every soul which will not hear Him, will be destroyed" (Acts iii. 23).

If Christ, the Incarnate Word, was a *Woe* to the impenitent, is it strange that the written Word, and the word preached should be a Woe also? Is not this what St. Paul says? the preaching of the Gospel is a savour of life unto life unto those that receive it, but is also a *savour of death unto death* unto them that *reject it* (2 Cor. ii. 10).

And now let us turn to the details of the prophecy before us. This Evangelical Army is a superhuman one—it is divine. It is reckoned at two hundred millions of horsemen. Is this an exaggeration? No. Even at the present time our English Societies speak of millions of copies of the Bible disseminated by them throughout the World.[5]

But to proceed. The horsemen in the vision have breastplates of fire. Yes; and is not *fire* commonly ascribed to God's Word? "The Lord will come with fire, and with His chariots like a whirlwind, ... and His rebuke with flames of fire" (Isa. lxvi. 15). "I will make *My words* in Thy mouth *fire,*" says God to Jeremiah (Jer. v. 15), "and this people *wood,* and it shall devour them." In the vision of Ezekiel displaying the Almighty enthroned on His chariot of the

[5] In one single year (1877) one Society, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, issued 183,518 Bibles, and 65,592 New Testaments. In one year, ending March 31, 1877, the British and Foreign Bible Society issued from London 698,430 Bibles and parts of the Old Testament; 788,492 copies of New Testament and parts, and New Testament with Psalms; on the Continent, &c., 304,890 Bibles, &c., and 878,930 New Testaments &c. Total, 2,670,742.

four Living Creatures which represent the fourfold Gospel, flames of *fire* issue from them, and the sound of a great host, (reminding us of the Army in the prophecy before us in the Apocalypse) and *coals of fire* are taken therefrom and are cast on the city (Ezek. i. and x.). The imagery of the present prophecy is also illustrated by the missionary work of Moses, punishing Egypt *with fire* and other *plagues;* and by the work of Elijah calling *fire* from heaven on his enemies. Even Christ Himself says, "I am come to send *fire* on earth, and a sword." (Matt. x. 34. Luke xii. 49.) And, as has been already observed, the Two Witnesses which are God's Witnesses to the World (probably the Two Testaments), are represented as smiting the earth with plagues, and it is added, that if any one will hurt them, *fire* proceedeth out of their *mouth*, and devoureth their enemies; and *that* vision is called the *second Woe*, as this is.

Again, the horsemen are described in the vision before us as clothed in *jacinth*. Let us remember that this is a *sacred* colour, as is well known to all careful readers of the Pentateuch (see Exod. xxv. 5, and *passim* in Exod. xxvi. and following chapters). The prophecy here also speaks of horses with heads like those *of lions*, and it speaks also of destruction coming forth *out of their mouths*. All these images are applied to Christ Himself in the Apocalypse. He is the *Lion* of the tribe of Judah (Rev. v. 5, cp. x. 3). And one of the four Gospels is compared to a *lion* (Rev. iv. 7). Two of Christ's Apostles were named by Him Boanerges or *sons of thunder*, and the mighty men of David are described as having *faces like lions*" (1 Chron. xii. 8).

And as to the *horses*, remember that Christ is revealed in this book as the rider on the *white horse* (Rev. vi. 2; xix. 11), and His Armies follow Him on *white horses;* and He is displayed as exercising a terrible power in His victorious career. His enemies are killed by the sword of Him *who sitteth on the horse*, by the sword that proceedeth out of His *mouth* (Rev. xix. 21), and they are consumed by *fire and brimstone* (Rev. xiv. 10; xix. 11), and the carnage is described by an awful comparison, as reaching even to the *bridles of*

the horses (xiv. 20). The Old Testament supplies similar imagery. "Thou didst ride, O Lord," says Habakkuk (Habak. iii. 8, 9), "upon *Thine horses* and Thy chariots of salvation. Thy bow was made naked, even Thy *Word*."

Nor is it surprising that this Evangelical army should be compared here to *serpents*. In the Old Testament the Rods of Moses and Aaron became serpents (Exod. iv. 3; vii. 9, 10, 15). Christ Himself was symbolized by a serpent (Num. xxi. 8, 9. John iii. 14). God is revealed in Scripture as sending *serpents* to destroy those who rebelled against His Word (Num. xxi. 6, 7), and He says by the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. viii. 17), "Behold, I will send *serpents*, cockatrices, among you, which will not be charmed, and they shall bite you, saith the Lord." The Word of God is like the Rod of Moses and of Aaron. It is powerful to save all true Israelites, but it becomes a serpent and devours the rods of those who reject it (Exod. vii. 9—12). It recoils with punitive power on the ungodly, and has a sting of death for the impenitent; as the Apostle says, "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin *is the law*" (1 Cor. xv. 5). And Christ says, "If I had not come and spoken to them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloke for their sin" (John xv. 22). By their unbelief His Word became to them a woe. In the words of the Psalmist and of the Apostle, "Their table became a snare to them and a trap, and those things which should have been for their wealth became an occasion of falling" (Ps. lxix. 22, 23. Rom. xi. 9). "The Word which I have spoken to you," says Christ, "that shall judge you at the last Day" (John xii. 48). It will arm Satan himself against those who have rejected the Gospel of Christ. It will become a serpent of death to all who despise Him who is the Life.

Is there anything strange in this? Does it not represent the law of God's dealings with men? The things of God are to us as we use them; either for life or for death. The waters of the Flood buoyed up the ark, but they drowned the wicked. The Manna in the wilderness—the type of Christ—fed the faithful for forty years, but to those who were disobedient it bred worms and stank (Exod. xvi. 20).

The ark of the covenant was to all faithful Israelites the Throne of God's Presence and Mercy, but the same ark brought wrath to His enemies the Philistines, and shame to their idol Dagon; and punishment to the men of Bethshemesh, and death to Uzzah; although it was a blessing to the house of the faithful Obed Edom and to the family of David in Sion.

In like manner the ancient Church of God, Jerusalem, was "the joy of the whole earth" to all true Israelites, but to her enemies God says by the prophet Zechariah (Zech. xii. 2, 3, 6), "I will make Jerusalem a *cup of trembling* to all who besiege her, and a *burdensome stone* to them; and all who burden themselves with her shall be cut to pieces, and I will make the governors of Judah like a hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf, and they shall devour them" (cp. Obadiah 18). And Christ Himself, our loving Saviour and adorable Redeemer,—Who in His infinite mercy came down from His throne of heavenly glory and became Man for our sakes, and poured out His life-blood for us on the Cross to save us from death, and to give us eternal life and glory,—He, even He, may become to us through our hardness of heart our most terrible Enemy. He is the true Corner Stone, elect, precious, and whoever believes in Him and builds in faith and love upon Him, shall be saved; but Christ, who is the corner stone, may become by our sin a stumbling stone and rock of offence, or in the prophet's words "a gin and a snare, and many shall stumble and fall thereby, and be broken and snared and taken" (Isa. viii. 14. Rom. ix. 33. 1 Pet. ii. 3). Let us remember His words, "Whoso shall fall on this stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder" (Matt. xxi. 44. Luke xx. 18). Christ is infinite in love to all who repent, believe, and obey Him; but to the impenitent and disobedient "our God is a consuming fire." The Apocalypse not only comforts us with the redeeming blood of the Lamb (Rev. v. 9), but it warns us also of the destroying wrath of the Lamb (Rev. vi. 16). And as this is true of the eternal Word, so also is it true of the written Word. It is true of Christ, and it is true of Holy Scripture also.

The foregoing interpretation may probably stagger some. And why? because, with deference be it said, some do not realize the truth, that the commonness of the Bible may be, and alas! is, to many a terrible Woe.

Let us consider this.

My assertion is—that this Prophecy reads to us a solemn warning, which the World now greatly needs.

Many millions of Copies of the Bible are now in circulation. A copy of it may be had for sixpence,[6] and a copy of the New Testament for twopence. But this commonness and cheapness of the Bible is surely an awful thing. For what is the Bible? It is God's Word. He speaks in it, and it declares His will, and reveals His gracious acts to us in Christ, and the outpourings of the Holy Ghost to sanctify and guide, and to strengthen and save us. God showed us by Moses with what reverence we ought to regard the Bible,—commanding the Pentateuch to be placed in the Holy of Holies by the side of the Ark (Deut. xxxi. 24). God is nearer to us now, than Christ was to the Jews, when He was upon earth. And He proclaims to us, more clearly and fully than Christ did to them, the blessings, infinite and eternal, which are prepared for men if they believe and obey His Word, and the terrible woes which are in store for them, if they will not listen to it, but neglect and disobey it.

And now it may be asked, Do we regard those myriads of Copies of the Bible, as St. John in this prophecy teaches us to do—as an immense Army, an Army of God, sweeping through the World with rapid speed and irresistible force; and as bearing with it the instruments of God's justice, indignation, and wrath to all who do not care for the message; and as a herald of the Great Day, when (as St. Paul speaks) the Lord Himself will "be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*"? (2 Thess. i. 8).

Although Almighty God is thus very near to us in Holy Scripture, and is ever speaking in our ears, are there not

[6] Bible Society's Report for 1877, p. xxi. S.P.C.K. Report for 1877, p. 272.

thousands and tens of thousands among us, who are now passing their lives as if the Bible had never been written? They think that they may give the go-by to it, and that they will never fare the worse for knowing nothing about it. This is the case with the professors of Secularism, Positivism, Socialism, Nihilism, and Internationalism. Surely it is an act of love, to warn them that the reception or rejection of the Bible is not a matter of indifference, as they seem to think; that it is not "an open question" which may be adjourned *sine die;* but is the most urgent of all questions; a question of eternal life or death. And this is precisely what St. John the beloved disciple, the apostle of love, has done in the prophecy before us. He sets before our eyes, in vivid imagery, the truth, that the Bible is not a poor, weak, helpless, despicable thing, and may not be trifled with. No, the Bible is more grand, majestic, and powerful than all the mightiest Armies that were ever marshalled on a field of battle, and will destroy all who despise it.

Others there are, who do not ignore the Bible, but in a proud, presumptuous, self-complacent spirit—like that with which the Scribes and Pharisees treated the Incarnate Word—carp and cavil at it. They "try to entangle it in its talk," and "lay wait for it." They deny its divine mission, and reject its authority and truth. Some even blaspheme it and scoff at it; in a word, they join in the same cry against it as that which burst forth from the crowd at Jerusalem on Good Friday, "Crucify Him, crucify Him." It would be well for them to listen to St. John's warning, that the Written Word will be like the Incarnate Word. It may have to pass through the agony of a Gethsemane, to be arraigned in a Council Hall, and in a Prætorium, and to suffer on a Calvary; but it will also have its Mount of Olives, its glorious Ascension, and its Coming again with Armies of Angels on the clouds to judge the World, and to put all its enemies under its feet.

This is what the Sceptic and the Scorner at Scripture are told by St. John. May they profit by his words!

Multitudes also there are who do not ignore the Bible, and who do not sneer at the Bible, who have it in their

hands and even profess to revere it, and who yet disobey the plain precepts of the Bible.

St. John points to them at the close of this prophecy. He speaks of two classes of persons; first, those who contravene the doctrines and worship taught in the Gospel, by adoration of the Creature; and, secondly, those who contradict its moral teaching by acts of malice, violence, and murder, or by impurity, dishonesty, and fraud.

As to the first, it is certain, that a very large part of the Western Church at the present time pays more homage to the Blessed Virgin, and even to the Roman Pontiff (whose laws supersede Holy Scripture), than they do to Christ Himself and His Word. "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!" was said by Him to the cities that heard that Word, and disobeyed it, and to those modern Chorazins and Bethsaidas—unless they repent—the Written Word will be a terrible Woe.

St. John specially speaks in this prophecy to us, who above all nations in the world have the fulness of the Divine Presence vouchsafed to us in Holy Scripture.

The desecration of the Lord's Day, the neglect of the public worship of God on that day, especially in our great towns, in spite of the clear commands of Scripture—these surely may look for a sentence of Woe.

Again, the bare toleration of the Bible in our primary schools of national instruction, especially in Board Schools—the proscription of Creeds and Catechisms explaining its true sense—the stimulus given to secular learning, as if it were the one thing needful; and the denial of all encouragement to Scriptural knowledge in our national system of School Inspection; in a word, the preference of man's knowledge to God's wisdom; surely these are sins against the Bible, and against the God of the Bible, which may be expected to bring down His judgments upon us, unless we repent.

Again, the multitude and diversity of our religious divisions, and our proud glorying in them, as if they were signs of religious life, in defiance of clear warnings of Holy Scripture against the sin of Schism, and its earnest exhortations to Unity, these surely may expect a sentence of Woe.

Again, in the Church, which holds the Bible in her hands, and has a command from God to teach it by precept and example—the bitter strife of opposite parties, the proud resistance to authority, the sarcastic evil-speaking of dignities, these most certainly may expect a sentence of Woe. The sacrilegious alienation of holy things to profane uses, the Simoniacal traffic in spiritual things, even by some Priests of God's Church, who preach His Word and minister His Sacraments, these may look for a sentence of Woe.

And when we come to consider other offences against the laws of Christian morality, plainly set forth in the Written Word of God, we see a long catalogue of sins notoriously rife among us. Adultery, fornication, divorce, infanticide, desertion of wives and children; drunkenness, murders, suicides, poisoning, thefts; gambling, forgeries, frauds in trade; blasphemy, disloyalty, sedition, slanderous calumnies, and arrogant and censorious judgments in the public press (even in that which calls itself religious)—these things, alas! are prevalent in a country which enjoys the inestimable blessings of God's presence in His Holy Word.

Well, therefore, may St. John warn us that the Holy Scriptures have an irresistible power; that they are like a mighty Army; that they have a sharp sting like serpents for a godless world; that fire goeth forth from their mouth to consume their enemies; that to such as will not hear, and believe, and repent of their sins, the Word of the living God is even like a deadly plague, and that the Trumpet of the Blessed Gospel of Christ is a Trumpet of Woe.

But lastly, the prophecy warns us that the sounding of this trumpet, the Sixth Trumpet, will be followed by the sounding of another trumpet, the Seventh or Last Trumpet (Rev. ix. 14, 15). And what is that? The Trumpet of Resurrection. The Trumpet of Judgment, the Trumpet of Eternity; the Trumpet, which will herald the Coming again of Him who ascended into heaven, and who will come again with "the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God" (1 Thess. i. 9; cp. 1 Cor. xv. 52), to raise us from our grave and to judge the world.—Hear the words of St. John announcing it: "The Seventh Angel sounded, and

there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever, King of kings and Lord of lords. And the four and twenty elders which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces and worshipped God, saying, We give Thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast reigned. And the Nations were angry, and Thy wrath is come; and the time of the dead, that they *should be judged*, and that Thou shouldest give the reward unto Thy servants the prophets, and to them that fear Thy name, small and great, and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth" (Rev. xi. 14—18). May it please God to give us all grace so to profit by the warnings of the Sixth Trumpet, that the Seventh Trumpet may not be to us a Trumpet of Woe, but may awaken us from our graves to an Eternity of Glory!

BISHOP SANDERSON, CONSCIENCE AND LAW.

The name of Bishop Sanderson will ever be associated in the minds of English Churchmen with questions of Conscience and Law, Civil and Ecclesiastical. The following Preface to an English translation, published by me, of his "Lectures on Conscience and Law" may find a place here.

"I take my ears," said King Charles the First, as we are told by Izaak Walton,[1] "to other preachers; but I take my Conscience to Mr. Sanderson." The royal estimate of him as a logician and casuist has been confirmed by the verdict of more than two centuries. Sanderson[2] had prepared himself for the work of dealing with the Human Conscience, by the discipline of Logic, on which he delivered lectures at Oxford, and on which he published a celebrated treatise,[3] which was for a long time the manual and text-book of students of dialectics; and when he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in the year 1642, he had exercised himself as a divine and a metaphysician in dealing with the principal questions of theology, both in doctrine

[1] Life of Sanderson in Bishop Jacobson's edition of Sanderson's Works, vi. 296.

[2] Bishop Sanderson was born at Rotherham, in Yorkshire, on September 19, 1587. He was matriculated at Lincoln College, Oxford, July 1, 1603; chosen Fellow of Lincoln College, May 3, 1606; resigned his fellowship, May 6, 1619; made Prebendary of Southwell, Notts, and Rector of Wyberton, Lincolnshire, in 1618, whence he was removed to Boothby Pagnell, near Grantham, in the same county, September 7, 1619; made Prebendary of the stall of Farindon-cum-Balderton in the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, September 3, 1629, and was Proctor in all the Convocations in the reign of Charles I.

[3] Printed in 1615.

and discipline, and of ethics and politics, which exercised the minds of men in that learned and restless age.

As Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, he delivered in the Divinity School seven lectures "On the Obligation of Oaths," in Michaelmas Term in the year 1646.[4]

He also delivered from the same chair ten lectures "On Conscience and Human Law," in the year 1647.

These lectures were written in Latin; and it tells much to the credit of the Professor, and for the intelligence of his audience, and of the age in which they lived, that lectures on such difficult subjects, and composed in that language, should have been so attractive and acceptable to his contemporaries as Sanderson's lectures were. It may be feared that in the nineteenth century we have degenerated in this respect, as in some others.

His biographer, Izaak Walton, thus speaks of these lectures on Conscience:—"How much the learned world stands obliged to him for these lectures I shall not attempt to declare, being very sensible that the best pens must needs fall short in the commendation of them, so that I shall only add that they continue to this day, and will do for ever, as a resolution of the most material doubts in casuistical divinity."[5]

These words were written in 1678; and in our own times the late Dr. Whewell (whose name it is enough to mention), Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in that University, thus expressed[6] his own opinion of the author of the lectures and of his work:—"Bishop Sanderson is generally considered, and with great justice, as one of the ablest and soundest of our theological

[4] These lectures on the Obligation of Oaths were translated into English by King Charles I., when a prisoner at Newport, in the Isle of Wight. See Life of Sanderson by Izaak Walton, Zouch's edition, p. 393, and Bishop Jacobson's edition of Sanderson's Works, vi. 305.

[5] "A book little in bulk," says Bishop Barlow in his letter to Walton, "but not so if we consider its excellent uses." As to his consummate casuistical skill, see his "Cases of Conscience," London, 1678, Sanderson's Works, vol. v. pp. 5—127.

[6] See Dr. Whewell's Preface to his edition of Sanderson's "Prælectiones de Obligatione Conscientiæ," Cambridge, 1857.

moralists. His lectures *De Obligatione Conscientiæ* were formerly much read, and even now it would be difficult to mention any better example of the ethical school, which preceded the influence" (so much deplored by wise and good men) "of Hobbes and Descartes." "This work," he adds, "may be considered as an excellent and striking example of a certain period of our ethical literature. . . . . and it would be difficult to discuss most of the moral questions which form the latter part of the work, in a more satisfactory manner than is there done."

Indeed, if Sanderson's work had not been produced, England could scarcely be said to have any sound philosophical treatise on casuistical theology. Jeremy Taylor's '*Ductor dubitantium*' seems to have been derived from it.

It will be remembered that at the eventful crisis of the history of the Church and Realm of England and of the Universities, when Dr. Sanderson was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, he was employed (in the year 1647) by the University to set forth Reasons against the "Solemn League and Covenant" then enforced by a Presbyterian Parliament,[7] and also against "the Negative Oath," by which the Parliament required English subjects to pledge themselves not to fight for the King.

But Sanderson did more than this; he proved his sincerity in the sight of God and man, and he showed his regard for his own Conscience, by suffering pains and penalties at the hands of those who had risen up in rebellion against the Crown and Church of England. He was enabled by God's grace to bear testimony to the truth; and was ejected by the Parliamentary visitors of the University, for Conscience' sake, from his Regius Professorship of Divinity, and from his Canonry of Christ Church[8]—seven months before the Martyrdom of his beloved King and Master, Charles the First.

From that time to the Restoration he lived in obscurity

[7] See Sanderson's Works, edited by Bishop Jacobson, vol. i. p. xvii, and vol. iv. p. 362.

[8] The Parliamentary order for his expulsion may be seen in Zouch's edition of Izaak Walton's Life of Sanderson, p. 395, York, 1867.

and danger at Boothby Pagnell, in the County of Lincoln, and his benefice there was sequestered; and while there, before the king's death, but after 1644, he had been wounded, plundered, and carried a prisoner, as a royalist and a Churchman, by the Parliamentary army, from his Parsonage to Lincoln gaol. He was, however, exchanged for a presbyterian minister, of Alington, in the same neighbourhood, who was a prisoner of the royal forces at Newark-on-Trent; and it was agreed, that after that time, as a consequence of that exchange, both of them should remain unmolested in their parishes.[9] He continued at Boothby Pagnell till the Restoration.

At the Restoration he was engaged, with other eminent divines, in the Savoy Conference; and the esteem in which Dr. Sanderson was held by the Church was publicly declared by the Convocation which appointed him to write the Preface prefixed to the English Book of Common Prayer at the last revision of the Liturgy.

He was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln in Henry VIIth's Chapel in Westminster Abbey, on October 28th, 1660; and departed this life, after an episcopate of self-sacrificing activity of two years and three months, at his episcopal palace at Buckden, between nine and ten in the evening of January 29, 1662, in the seventy-sixth year of his age.

The following words were written by him a short time before his death:—

"I, Robert Sanderson, Doctor of Divinity, an unworthy minister of Jesus Christ, and by the Providence of God Bishop of Lincoln, being by the long continuance of an habitual distemper brought to a great bodily weakness and faintness of spirits, but by the great mercy of God without any bodily pain otherwise, or decay of understanding, do make this my Will and testament, written all with my own hand, revoking all former wills by me heretofore made, if any such shall be found.

"First, I commend my soul into the hands of Almighty God *as of a faithful Creator,* which I humbly beseech Him mercifully to accept, looking upon it not as it is in itself,

[9] Walton's Life of Sanderson, ed. Jacobson, vi. p. 319.

infinitely polluted with sin, but as it is redeemed and purged with the precious blood of His only beloved Son, and my most sweet Saviour Jesus Christ, in confidence of Whose merits and mediation alone it is that I cast myself upon the mercy of God, for the pardon of my sins, and for the hopes of eternal life.

"And here I do profess, that as I have lived, so I desire and, by the grace of God, resolve to die, in the communion of the Catholic Church of Christ, and a true son of the Church of England; which, as it stands by law established, to be both in doctrine and worship agreeable to the Word of God, and in the most and most material points of both, conformable to the faith and practice of the godly churches of Christ in the primitive and purer times I do firmly believe; led so to do not so much from the force of custom and education, to which the greatest part of mankind owe their particular different persuasions in point of religion, as upon the clear evidence of truth and reason, after a serious and impartial examination of the grounds as well of Popery as Puritanism, according on that measure of understanding and those opportunities which God hath afforded me. And herein I am abundantly satisfied, that the schism which the Papists on the one hand, and the superstition which the Puritans on the other hand, lay to our charge, are very justly chargeable to themselves respectively. Wherefore I humbly beseech Almighty God, the *Father of Mercies*, to preserve this Church by His power and providence in truth, peace, and godliness evermore unto the world's end. Which doubtless He will do, if the wickedness and security of a sinful people, and particularly those sins that are so rife, and seem daily to increase among us, of unthankfulness, riot, and sacrilege, do not tempt His patience to the contrary."

A few words concerning the publication of these Lectures may now be added.

Nearly nine years ago, on my promotion to the See of Lincoln, I specified among the books selected by me as subjects for Examination of Candidates for Holy Orders in this Diocese, "*Bishop Sanderson's Lectures on Conscience.*"

But I found, to my regret, that copies of them were not easy to be procured, and that the Latin language, in which they were written, operated as a hindrance to the study of them. Dr. Whewell's edition of the original, accompanied with an abridged English version, in some respects diminished the difficulty, but not so fully as could be wished.

In the meantime, the condition of the Church of England, with the various important and difficult questions on the relations of Church and State, and "on the adequate rule of Conscience," and on the subject-matter, and the efficient cause, the obligation, and final cause, of Human Laws, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, which are now occupying men's minds, and are exercising a powerful influence on the destinies of the Church and Realm of England, have renewed and stimulated my desire to see an edition of Bishop Sanderson's Lectures in an English dress, and in such a form as to be easily accessible, not only to Students of Theology, and Candidates for Holy Orders, but to all classes of society. It would not be easy to mention any work of like compass better adapted to settle men's minds, with regard to the questions which I have specified, than these Lectures of Bishop Sanderson.

Let me premise that, on account of the scholastic terminology of the *first* Lecture, some persons may perhaps be deterred from the study of this work. It may be suggested that it would be well to *omit* that Lecture, in the first perusal and to return to it when the reader has become more familiar with the general scope and contents of the whole.

The English translation offered to the reader is partly a reproduction of one published by Mr. Lewis, at London, in 1722; the style of which, though somewhat antiquated, seemed even on that account to be a better representation of a writer of the seventeenth century than an entirely new version would be. This translation of Mr. Lewis has been revised, and (may I not hope?) corrected in very many places, in the present publication. Some critics may think that the work of emendation (which has been much more laborious than I had anticipated) might have been carried farther.

Let me be allowed here to adopt the words of the learned Editor of Bishop Sanderson's Works—one of his successors in the Divinity Chair at Oxford, and of Bishop Pearson in the Episcopal see of Chester—Bishop Jacobson:[1]—

"The times in which Sanderson's lot was cast gave him the opportunity of seeing the Church of England in humiliation as well as in prosperity. He was no hireling, to abate at all his love and devotion in the *evil day*. To him a season of depression and distress was indeed blessed; and he has an eminent place among the *acceptable men* whom the fire of affliction has *tried and purified*. . . . . After making due allowance for all peculiarities, personal and political, we shall ever have in him the example of one, beyond whom few, if any, have at any time been permitted to advance, in a thorough understanding and hearty appreciation of the position, privileges, and duties of his Church and ours; one of the many whom we may be thankful to follow, as, under the training of that Church, they followed Christ."

"Being dead he yet speaketh."[2] May Bishop Sanderson's voice be heard by many willing ears and loving hearts in the present age; which, in many respects, especially in its controversies and conflicts, and in its consequent trials and dangers, nearly resembles that in which he lived.

C. L.

[1] Sanderson's Works, vol. i. p. xxii, ed. Oxford, 1854. Let me here acknowledge my great obligations to Bishop Jacobson in the notes to the present volume.

[2] Heb. xi. 4.

Whitsuntide, 1877.

ON ECCLESIASTICAL LEGISLATION.

First, as to Legislation in Ecclesiastical matters, let me notice what took place in Parliament in reference to the Public Worship Regulation Bill. I will not refer to others, but will confine myself to the expression of opinions for which I am responsible.

On Monday, April the 20th, 1874, the "Public Worship Regulation Bill" was introduced into the House of Lords by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishop of Lincoln expressed a hope that it might not be supposed, especially by the Clergy, that the Bishops were desirous of dealing with matters affecting the Ritual of the Church, in their capacity of Peers of Parliament, rather than in their character of Spiritual Fathers and Rulers of the Church. The Bill to be introduced for the "Regulation of the Public Worship" of the Church did (he said), as its title declared, profess to control and direct, by means of Parliamentary action, the work of the Church herself in her most sacred functions and solemn offices of religion; and it virtually concerned the Clergy (the ministers of the Church—about 20,000 in number) in their temporal and spiritual interests; and he was of opinion that ample opportunity ought to be given to the Clergy, who had no voices in Parliament, for expressing their sentiments upon it personally and by means of their representatives in the Provincial Synods or Convocations of the Church.

He trusted that, by such means, the evil might be averted, which would otherwise arise, of a misunderstanding and estrangement between the Bishops and the Clergy; which had led to such disastrous consequences in the eighteenth century. He was persuaded that even those among the

Clergy, who had been charged with extravagances and excesses in Ritual, which the present Bill was designed to restrain, and which he greatly deplored, would be willing to recognize and submit to the Church herself—speaking authoritatively—in her Convocations; and therefore having heard on credible authority that it was intended to fix the second reading of the Bill for to-morrow week, the 28th instant, he ventured to express a hope that it would not be pressed unduly forward, especially as the Convocation of this Province would meet on the same day for the transaction of business; and that the Church herself would be invited and enabled to exercise that authority which belongs to all National Churches, and to declare her judgment on those rubrics concerning certain questions of Ritual which were now regarded by many as doubtful, and which had been diversely interpreted in Ecclesiastical Courts; and also be empowered to revise such Rubrics as seemed to her to require revision, and that thus a peaceful and happy solution would be obtained of our present difficulties, which would be greatly increased by legislation in Parliament for the regulation of public worship, without any previous or concurrent reference to the opinions of the Clergy, and to the authority of the Church herself.

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury met on the 28th April, but measures were not then adopted in the direction above mentioned.

The Bill having been read a second time without a division, the Bishop of Lincoln endeavoured to plead again the same cause, on the motion for going into Committee, on Thursday, June 4th, in the following terms. He has added one or two statements for the sake of clearness:—

My Lords, I ought to apologize for venturing to trespass now on your indulgence, even for a few minutes. But having been nearly thirty years a member of Convocation, I may be permitted to say something with regard to that body which has been referred to in the amendment now before your lordships, and also in the remarks which have just been made by the noble and learned lord on the Woolsack. And in order that I may not be charged with undue presumption, I

beg to add that I rise after previous communication with the most rev. prelate who has laid this Bill on the table of your lordships' House, and with his encouragement. My lords, I do not rise for the purpose of saying that legislation is not necessary; on the contrary, I believe it to be urgently and imperatively required, for two distinct purposes—first, for the amendment of the constitution and procedure of our Ecclesiastical Courts; and, secondly, for the correction of lawless excesses and extravagances on the one side, and of the no less lawless negligence and slovenliness on the other side, which exist in the Ritual of some of our churches. But in order that legislation in so sacred a thing as public worship may be effective, and in order that it may produce harmony and peace, and not lead to discord, disunion, and disruption, it must carry with it the hearts of the Clergy. The Clergy of the Church of England are about 20,000 in number, planted in every parish of the country, and they exercise a powerful influence, not only spiritual and religious, but also moral, political, and social. It would be an evil day for the Legislature if it were to alienate the affections of the Clergy; it would be disastrous for any administration to forfeit their confidence; above all, it would be calamitous for the Episcopate of England to be estranged from the Clergy. England, in former days, had bitter experience of the evil effects of such a separation, especially in the period dating from the Revolution of 1688 for about a century, beginning with the secession of some of the most learned and pious of the Clergy, the Nonjurors, and continued through the dreary and dismal period of the Hoadleyan and other controversies, and terminating in another secession—that of the Wesleyans—from which we have not yet recovered: these were some of the unhappy results produced by a want of confidence and good understanding between the Bishops and Clergy of the Church. The twenty thousand clergy of the Church of England are not represented in this House, and none of them have seats in the other. It is therefore more incumbent on the Bishops to communicate their sentiments to your lordships, on matters which vitally concern their temporal and spiritual interests, such as the Bill now

before you. Let me, therefore, be permitted to report their feelings upon it. They describe this measure as a Bill for the coercion of the clergy under severe pains and penalties in matters uncertain and ambiguous. Their complaint is that Bishops are resorting to Parliament to compel the clergy to obey rubrics which are doubtful, while some of the Bishops themselves violate rubrics which are clear; as, for instance, by ministering Confirmation to whole railfuls of candidates at once. They complain that Bishops desire by means of this Bill to enforce upon the clergy what is called the Purchas judgment, which prohibits them to use an Eucharistic vestment, while some Bishops disobey that judgment which enjoins them to wear an Eucharistic vestment, the cope, while celebrating the Holy Communion on festivals in their own cathedrals. Ritualistic excesses are great evils, but Episcopal inconsistency and despotism are not more venial. My lords, I report simply what I hear, and hear with sorrow and alarm. We seem to be on the eve of a great crisis; it may be an ecclesiastical and civil disruption; and who can foresee the consequences, both to the Church and Realm? Where, therefore, is the remedy? It consists, I would humbly submit, in treating the Church as a Church, and not merely as a department of the State. You desire, my lords, to check Romanism by this Bill; but you will give the greatest triumph to Romanism that it can possibly wish for, if you treat the Church of England as an Act of Parliament Church. This is what the Church of Rome desires her to be, and if you treat her as such, perversions to Romanism will become more and more frequent among us. Let me entreat you not to despise the Synods of the Church. This is a policy which Romanism would welcome at your hands. Let me implore you to show some regard to the Church of England in ritual matters, as represented by her ancient Convocations. They have many claims on your esteem. We owe the Book of Common Prayer to the Convocations. The Convocations of the Church of England at the present time contain very many members of great piety, wisdom, and learning, and exercising great influence in all parts of the country. If in spiritual matters you

show no deference to Convocation, you will alienate the clergy of the Church. But if, on the contrary, you treat Convocation with respect, you will conciliate the affections of the clergy. And then legislation on such matters, which, without Convocation, will be abortive and obnoxious, and will lead to dissension and disruption, will become comparitively easy, and will allay strife and produce harmony and peace. You may disparage Convocation, if you will, but you cannot afford to despise its influence: that influence is powerfully exercised over a large number, not only of clergy, but laity. Convocation is an energetic instrument for good; because its authority is acknowledged by many who will not readily submit in spiritual things to secular power. It is, indeed, objected to Convocation that the laity are not represented in it, but this is surely a mere verbal objection; the action of Convocation is fenced on all sides by the intervention of the laity; Convocation cannot originate anything with the view of framing a canon, without a licence from the Crown: and to give effect to synodical canons the subsequent assent of the Crown is requisite; and they cannot acquire legal validity without the authority of Parliament. It cannot, therefore, be said that the laity have not great influence over Convocation; and no one need fear any ecclesiastical domination from it. But it is also objected that the parochial clergy are not adequately represented by it. Be it so. Convocation is very desirous to remove this objection. Let it be enabled to do so. But even now the parochial clergy—yes, even some among them who are charged with ritualistic excesses, have publicly declared in the petition of the 800 clergymen presented by the noble duke (Duke of Marlborough), their willingness to submit to the judgment of Convocation in doubtful rubrics, and therefore the authority and influence of Convocation are great for putting an end to religious controversies, and for producing and maintaining peace. Will not, therefore, your lordships permit a reference to Convocation for such purposes as those? Let me entreat you to hold out an olive branch of peace to the Clergy by such an overture as that. But it is also said that Convocation made a surrender of its synodical power

at the Restoration. This I beg to deny: it merely gave up its powers of taxing itself; but its synodical and even judicial powers in certain respects were recognized, as your lordships may remember, by a large majority of the Judges of England in the reign of Queen Anne; and though in the stagnant times of religious lethargy which succeeded, the exercise of those powers may have lain dormant, yet its functions have never been abdicated, and if in the present crisis a resort is made to Convocation for the clearing up of those rubrics, such as the rubric concerning the position of the celebrant at consecration, and the rubric concerning ornaments and vestments, and for the revision of such rubrics as may seem to need to be revised, and if the most reverend Presidents of the Southern and Northern Convocations would give specific directions accordingly to their respective Provincial Synods, having first received licence from the Crown to treat thereon, there is little reason to doubt that in due time a peaceful solution might be arrived at with regard to such matters as require amicable adjustment previously to legislation upon them. I am confirmed in this opinion by the amendments of the right reverend prelate, distinguished by his eloquence and ability (the Bishop of Peterborough), to which the noble and learned lord on the Woolsack referred. I confess, with all submission, that I should prefer that such matters as those were first committed to the consideration of the Synods of the Church, and not first proposed in a section or schedule of an Act of Parliament. This course seems to savour too much of constituting Parliament into a Synod on doctrine and ritual. Indeed, the very matter to which the noble and learned lord referred, the Athanasian Creed, which is one that touches the essence of all religious doctrine, would itself involve a reference to Convocation for the alteration of a rubric, because that Creed is to be recited by the people, not alternately with the minister, as is too often the case, but as a whole; and whatever the minister may do or not do, the people have a right to the Creed, the faithful laity of every parish have a claim to it, and they cannot be deprived of that right by any exemption of the minister. My lords,

on Tuesday last, the noble duke (the Duke of Richmond) who moved the second reading of the Bill for the Abolition of Patronage in the Church of Scotland referred with just pride and honourable satisfaction to the assistance he had received from the deliberations and decisions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, as exercising great influence, and tending much to promote the success of that ministerial measure. May I not venture to appeal very respectfully to the noble duke, and inquire whether the Bill now before Parliament for regulating the worship of the Church of England would not have a far better chance of becoming law, and of affording general satisfaction to the clergy and laity of the Church, if similar regard were paid to the deliberations of the Convocations of England as are now being manifested by Her Majesty's Government to those of the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland. Let me remind your lordships of the words of one of the most distinguished laymen of England, Dr. Samuel Johnson, who, when in a time of religious lukewarmness, he was rallied by his Scotch biographer, Boswell, on having said that he would stand before a battery of cannon to restore the Convocation of England to its full powers, replied with a determined look and earnest voice, and said, "And would I not, sir? Shall the Presbyterian Kirk have its General Assembly, and shall the Church of England be denied its Convocation?" I know not, my lords, whether the noble earl who has proposed the present amendment means to press it to a division; for my own part, I would rather be content to leave the matter to the wisdom of Her Majesty's Government, and to the most reverend Prelates who preside over the Convocations of the two provinces, in full confidence that the licence to treat concerning ritual matters which was freely and graciously conceded by the Crown to Convocation, under the recent administration of Mr. Gladstone, may not be denied to Convocation by his successors in office, and that, under the paternal authority of the Archbishops of the two provinces, and under the Divine blessing, the deliberations of Convocation may be so guided as to avert the dangers, both civil and religious, which now threaten us, and to conduce in the

most effectual manner to the prevention of strife, and to the preservation of peace.

His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his willingness to promote and regulate the action of Convocation.

On Tuesday, June 9th, and on Monday, the 15th of June, the consideration of the Bill in Committee was proceeded with.

The most memorable incident in the debate on the latter occasion was the *withdrawal* of certain amendments (of which notice had been previously given), for the non-imposition of any penalties or disabilities, under this Bill, on any clergyman with regard to the side of the Table at which the Minister ought to stand when saying the prayer of Consecration; or the use of the words of administration otherwise than separately; or the celebration of the Holy Communion during the time of Evening Service, or the daily use of Morning and Evening Service; or the use of the Commination Service, and one or two other matters; to which was added, by two temporal Peers, the use of the Athanasian Creed; and the use of certain words in the form of Ordination of Priests.

It was proposed in these amendments that the above-mentioned matters should, as far as legal proceedings under this Bill were concerned, be neutralized and rendered indifferent, *by the action of Parliament.* A great relief and general thankfulness were felt, I believe, that a parliamentary discussion on such matters as these, affecting the faith of the Church, and the most solemn ministrations of her worship, was avoided. But the *proposal* of such questions as these for consideration and determination by the Legislature (constituted as that Legislature now is, by the changes that have taken place in the House of Commons in the last fifty years) without reference to the spiritual authority of the Church in her Synods suggests matters for grave and serious reflection.

It seems to indicate that there is urgent need for careful examination into the true character of the relations of the Church (which is an integral part of the English Consti-

tution) to the Legislature, in dealing with such questions as these.

The principle which is involved in all such amendments is clearly this; that matters affecting the doctrine and worship of the Church of England may be settled in Parliament, without any previous reference to the Church in her synods.

This principle seems to be unconstitutional.

In proof of this assertion, let me refer to the history of our Book of Common Prayer, which is our standard of Doctrine and Ritual, at three different epochs, first soon after the Restoration, in 1662, next after the Revolution, in 1669, and lastly two years ago.

Early in the year 1662 the Book of Common Prayer was revised by the Convocations of both Provinces, being authorized by the Crown, as is stated in the Preface to that Book, and in the Act of Uniformity. It was then transmitted to the King in Council for approval; and by him it was sent to the House of Lords, where, after a debate upon it, the Lord Chancellor, the celebrated Earl of Clarendon, was authorized to acknowledge, in the name of the House, the work of Convocation, and to express its approval of it. It was then sent to the other House of Parliament, where it met with a similar reception.

This was the constitutional method, sanctioned by the Legislature, of dealing with questions affecting the doctrine and worship of the Church.

Let us now proceed to another era in our history.

In the year 1689 a Bill, called "The Comprehension Bill," was brought into the House of Lords by the Earl of Nottingham. That Bill bore a remarkable resemblance to the amendments which were to have been moved in Committee on "The Public Worship Regulation Bill."

Its design was to conciliate different persons and parties, by declaring certain things in the ritual of the Church to be indifferent; so that no one should be punished for omitting them; such as the cross in Baptism and sponsors; kneeling at the Holy Communion; the use of the Surplice.

At first that Bill found favour with the Lords, especially

under the influence of Bishop Burnet. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Sancroft, being a Non-juror, took no part; and Bishop Ken and six other Bishops were Non-jurors. The Bill passed the House of Lords mainly by the help of proxies; and it was sent to the Commons. But *the Commons* were of opinion that the questions dealt with in the Bill were matters of Ecclesiastical cognizance; and that the *advice of the Church herself ought first to be had* upon them; and therefore the Commons rejected the Bill, and agreed, without a division, to an Address to the Crown, praying it to summon Convocation to deliberate on these matters, and they asked the concurrence of the House of Lords in that Address. That concurrence was voted by the Lords: and thus the judgment of Parliament was, almost unanimously, declared on the constitutional method of dealing with such matters as these. It is remarkable that Bishop Burnet himself afterwards expressed his thankfulness for the failure of his own measure; for if it had been successful, he said, it would have caused a schism.

Let us now come to our own times.

In 1872 the "Act of Uniformity Amendment Act" was passed. In the preamble to that Act are the following words, "Whereas Her Majesty was pleased to *authorize the Convocations of Canterbury and York* to consider the Report of the Commissioners on Ritual, and to report to Her Majesty thereon; and the said Convocations have accordingly made their *first Reports* to Her Majesty, *Be it therefore enacted*," *&c.*

We may observe that the Act speaks of the *first* Reports of Convocation on Ritual, implying that Convocation would be enabled and expected to make *other Reports* in succession; and Convocation would already have done so, if Parliament had not been dissolved, and if Convocation had not been dissolved with it. It appears, therefore, that the constitutional mode of proceeding is, that Convocation should now be authorized to continue and complete the work of revising the rubrics; a course commenced during Mr. Gladstone's Administration, when Lord Hatherley was on the Woolsack; a course which might have afforded a

peaceful and speedy solution of the difficulties of a crisis, which is now causing a wide-spread and growing disquietude, anxiety, and alarm.

On June 16, 1874, I added the following words in a pamphlet then published, entitled "*Senates and Synods.*" Any course for "the regulation of the Public Worship of the Church" merely by Act of Parliament, without any reference to the Church herself, seems also to be dangerous in other respects. Let me illustrate this assertion. I do not for a moment doubt that the present Bill is intended by its promoters to check the growth of Romanism, and to strengthen the cause of the English Reformation and of the English Church. And I heartily wish it success in doing so. But I should very much fear that if it is carried through Parliament without any such reference to the Church, it will do much to aggrandize Romanism, and to paralyze the cause of the English Reformation and of the English Church. Let me explain my meaning. A long and careful study of the controversy with the Church of Rome convinces me that the strongest argument which the advocates of the Church of Rome bring against us, and by which they beguile most perverts from us, and gain most proselytes to themselves, is this: that the Church of England is not of divine institution; that it has no spiritual character, and no fixed principles; that it is a mere creature of the State; a mere Act of Parliament Church; that it depends for its doctrine and worship on the veering winds and fluctuating tides of Parliamentary majorities: and has therefore no claim on the spiritual allegiance of any who regard Christianity as a Divine revelation, and who revere the Church of Christ as its divinely appointed depositary and guardian. If, therefore, Parliament legislates for the worship of the Church, without any regard to the authority of the Church herself, the persons who will most exult and triumph in such legislation will be the emissaries and controversialists of the Church of Rome. They will say that their bitterest taunts against us have been justified by ourselves.

I will not dwell on the consequent perils of discord, distrust, and disruption which threaten the Church; and will

extend themselves to our civil institutions. It is therefore earnestly to be hoped, that Her Majesty's advisers and the Legislature may be induced to act on those constitutional precedents, which have hitherto secured the faith and unity of the Church of England, in peaceful harmony with the State.

A conversation took place on Wednesday, April 29th, 1874, in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, on the presentation of a Petition from some distinguished Laymen, praying that sufficient time might be given to the Clergy for the consideration of the "*Public Worship Regulation Bill,*" then before Parliament; and I wish to state somewhat more fully what was briefly expressed by me on that occasion.

It is agreed on all sides that the constitution and modes of procedure of our Ecclesiastical Courts require amendment. It is also a general opinion, that a remedy is needed for abuses prevailing in some of our Churches, in the ritual of Divine service, whether by excess or defect.

The "Public Worship Regulation Bill" is based on these two acknowledged facts.

We need not now inquire, whether measures are not equally required for the correction of Ecclesiastics, whether Bishops or Clergy, who may offend by unsoundness of doctrine or viciousness of life; and whether such offences might not be dealt with in the same legislative enactment as that which concerns the Public Worship of the Church.

The question now submitted for consideration is—

Whether the "Public Worship Regulation Bill" does not require the complement of certain co-ordinate provisions, in order to render it a safe and salutary enactment at the present time.

The Bill is of a stringent, coercive, and penal character. Under its operation a Bishop might find himself to be divested of his character and influence as a spiritual Father, and be constrained to enforce on the Clergy of his Diocese a rigid uniformity under severe penalties, in certain ritual matters which have hitherto been *regarded as doubtful* by many very eminent men, both in Church and State, and

have been diversely interpreted by Ecclesiastical Judges, but which may hereafter be decided in one exclusive sense by Ecclesiastical Courts.

There seem to be two important principles to be kept steadily in view at the present juncture.

On the one side, it is the duty of a Church not to surrender its power of Toleration, in things of questionable obligation, especially in a free age and country like ours. Remedies good in themselves may become relatively bad, by reason of the state of the patient to whom they are applied.

We need the higher and nobler functions of Charity and Equity to temper the rigour of Law, and to prevent Law from degenerating into injustice.

On the other hand, while a large measure of Liberty is conceded, care is to be taken that it may not be abused into an occasion of Licentiousness.

The result of these two propositions is, that the measure of Liberty ought to be determined by Law.

In other words, it ought not to be left to individual Clergymen to choose, by an eclectic process, what rites and ceremonies they please, from ancient, mediæval, or modern Churches, and to import them into their own Churches, and to impose them on their own congregations; which would lead to endless confusion; but the Church of England, exercising that authority which belongs to all national churches, ought to define and declare publicly by her *synodical judgments* what things in her services are to be regarded as obligatory, and what may be considered as indifferent. And she ought, as an Established Church, to seek for legal sanction from the Crown (if she proceeds by the enactment of Canons) and from Parliament also (if she frames new rubrics) for these her authoritative definitions and declarations.

These were the principles on which our Book of Common Prayer was framed and revised.

To illustrate by examples what seems now expedient to be done.

The *Eastward* position of the Celebrant at the prayer of Consecration in the Holy Communion was condemned and prohibited by the Court of Final Appeal; and the

position at the *north end* was declared, in the Purchas Judgment, to be the legal one.

Being desirous of showing dutiful obedience to the Laws of the Church of England, I endeavoured to persuade the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln to consecrate the Holy Communion at the north side of the Table, so as to be able more readily, in compliance with the rubric, "to break the bread before the people," i.e. with their face toward them.

But does it follow, that a Bishop should desire to be armed with powers (such as are given him by the present Bill) to *enforce* this Law? And does it also follow, that he should wish to be morally compelled, on the complaint of three Parishioners, to enforce it?

By no means; for by such a course he would probably drive from their cures some zealous clergymen in his Diocese, and produce a schism in the Church.

He would indeed be thankful for Uniformity, if he could have it, as well as Unity; but if he cannot have both, he would not, in such matters, sacrifice Unity to Uniformity: this would be to prefer the letter to the spirit.

But would he wish to leave things as they are?

No; for at present (to specify an example) some clergymen who consecrate in the northern position are prone to condemn a brother who holds the eastward position, as doing what is illegal; and thus strifes are engendered, destroying the peace and efficiency of the Church.

Where, then, is the solution?

Let *both* of these two positions of the Celebrant[1] *be declared by authority to be lawful;* in other words, let the position be *pronounced to be indifferent.*

The *position* of the Holy *Table* itself is already declared by Law to be indifferent. According to the Rubric, it may be in the chancel, and it may be in the body of the Church. Why not also the position of the *Celebrant* at the Holy Table in saying the prayer of Consecration?

Each of these two positions of the Celebrant has its own special significance. The one represents the divine grace and gift to man. The other expresses man's plea for mercy

[1] This has now been virtually done by the Ridsdale Judgment.

and acceptance with God. The one looks manward from God; the other looks God-ward from man. The one position exhibits the benefits of communion with Christ. The other commemorates—and pleads the merits of—His one Sacrifice for Sin. In the Sacrament, we represent to God Christ's Sacrifice for us; and in the Sacrament the benefits of that Sacrifice, offered once for all, are continually applied to us. We gave to Him our flesh at His Incarnation; and in the Sacrament He gives back to us, for our spiritual sustenance, that flesh, glorified by its union with God.[2]

It might be well that the English Church, by permitting and authorizing both those positions, should set before her people the double aspect and meaning of that blessed Sacrament; and thus, even by relaxing the strictness of ritual uniformity, preserve and represent unity and completeness of doctrine concerning these Holy Mysteries.

The Purchas Judgment, while it prescribed the use of the Cope by the Celebrant in Cathedrals on great festivals, condemned the use of a distinctive Eucharistic dress by the Celebrant in Parish Churches.[3]

As long as the preliminary Rubric remains in the Prayer Book, permitting the use of the vestments specified in the First Prayer Book of King Edward the Sixth, many will be of the opinion that such Vestments may be used. Let us no longer waste our energies on vexatious and ruinous litigation (we have lately been told in Parliament that two lawsuits cost as much as would have built and endowed a Parish Church); but let *the national Church of England* declare *by her Synodical authority* that a simple distinctive dress for the Celebrant at the Holy Eucharist is *permissible* with the consent of the Ordinary, but not to be enforced upon any.[3]

[2] See Bishop Andrewes, Sermons, I. pp. 30, 43, 82, 83, 231, ed. Oxf. 1841.

[3] The Ridsdale Judgment now affirms the use of the Cope in Cathedrals at all celebrations, but forbids the Chasuble, &c., in Parish Churches.

But now that the surplice has become the usual vestment in *preaching*, and is commonly worn by laymen and boys in choirs, some simple, distinctive vestment for the clergy in the most solemn function of their

A few years ago the adoption of the *surplice* in the *pulpit* in some parish churches produced a commotion. And why? Because it was an innovation introduced there by individual clergymen, and because the people were naturally uneasy and suspicious, in the apprehension that other innovations might follow in rapid succession without limitation. But now that the surplice has been declared to be a lawful vestment in preaching, the objections have passed away.

Also, as soon as *the Cope* was pronounced by the Final Court of Appeal to be the lawful vestment of the Celebrant in Cathedrals, no exception was taken to its use.[4]

Again, at the present time, a Bishop may, at his discretion, require two full services on a Sunday in any Church in his Diocese; and he is generally presumed to have a discretionary power of enforcing daily service, and the observance of Saints' Days and Holy Days, and the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism after the Second Lesson, and public Catechizing.

But if the present Bill were to become law, it would seem that any incumbent "who failed to observe the directions in the Book of Common Prayer relating" to these and other things (I quote the words of the Bill), might be subject to severe penalties. I refer to these things as showing that there is, and must be, some discretionary power lodged somewhere; and it will be difficult to say where it can be vested, if not in the Ordinary.[5]

It is not hereby proposed that alterations should be made

ministry seems very desirable. The *Cope*, being *prescribed* by Law in Cathedrals, might, under proper safeguards, be *permitted* in Parish Churches. This has been recommended in the Convocation of Canterbury.

[4] I have worn a Cope in Lincoln Cathedral ever since the Purchas Judgment was given; that is, for eight years, and I have never heard any objection to it. Other Bishops have done the same.

[5] The writer may be allowed to record with thankfulness, that he was able to attend in Parliament on Wednesday, July 15, 1874, and to vote, with seven other Bishops, against the amendment from the Commons in the "Public Worship Regulation Bill," which would have destroyed all the discretionary authority of the Diocesans, in the working of the Bill, and have transferred it entirely to the two Archbishops. The majority against that clause was only 12—but (as subsequent experience has shown) it saved the Church from a great calamity.

in matters where the Law of the Church of England is clear, or where there is a *consensus* of primitive Antiquity. But there are one or two other ritual matters (and I do not think that there need be more) which might, I conceive, be declared by the lawful authority of the Church and State to be indifferent; and if this course were pursued, then the danger of a Schism would be averted.

In adopting such a course we should be treading in the steps of our own Reformers, and of those who revised the Prayer Book at the Restoration.

The *doctrine* contained in the Prayer Book is unalterable, because it is the Faith revealed in Holy Scripture, and received by the Primitive Church.

But the English Reformers altered the Ritual of the Church of England no less than three times in the course of twenty years; and in the Preface which was prefixed to that Book at the last review, about 200 years ago, and which is due to one of the most judicious of English Prelates, Bishop Sanderson, it is affirmed that "it hath been the wisdom of the Church of England ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much laxness in admitting, any variation from it"—and it "is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, *such changes and alterations* should be made therein, as to those that are *in place of Authority* should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient."

It may therefore be presumed, that our Reformers and our Revisers of the Book of Common Prayer would, as wise, learned, pious, and charitable men, contemplating the altered circumstances of the times, and the condition of the Church in these days, be the first to relax some of the stringent laws of our Ritual, and to impart to it more expansiveness and elasticity, and to pronounce *certain things to be indifferent by lawful Authority*, in order that they might promote those high and holy purposes of faith, worship, and morals, for which the Prayer Book was

framed, and which are paramount to all rites and ceremonies of human institution.

If such a course, as has now been traced out, were followed, there is reason to believe that, under God's good Providence, our strifes would be appeased, and Law and Order be restored, and the Church would be free to devote her energies to the performance of her divinely appointed work, that of waging war against ignorance and sin, and of diffusing the Gospel of Christ at home and abroad, and of promoting God's Glory, and the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind.

ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION.

Much scruple having been felt by some of the Clergy as to the propriety of submitting to the decisions of the Court of Arches, in its present form, and also to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, or to speak more correctly, to the Judgment of the Crown, acting on the recommendations of the Judicial Committee, the following letter was written by me in January, 1877, to a Clergyman of the Diocese asking my opinion whether the Clergy would be justified in resisting the decisions of that Court.

In reply to your letter I would observe that—

The principles which ought to be carefully borne in mind by all who deal with this subject are these :—

1. All authority is from God. This is clearly stated in Holy Scripture by St. Paul (Rom. xiii. 1, 2), "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers (or authorities), for there is no power (or authority) but of God; the powers (or (authorities) that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God ; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation ;" and St. Peter says (1 Peter ii. 13), "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors ;" and St. Paul therefore writes to the Bishop of Crete (Titus iii. 1), "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man."

Resistance, therefore, to human authority in commands which are not unlawful, is disobedience to God, from Whom all authority flows.

2. If the human authority commands what is plainly contrary to the law of God, Whose representative and vicegerent the human authority is, in such cases the authority is not to be obeyed, because all men are under a prior and paramount obligation to obey God. This was exemplified in the history of the three children at Babylon, refusing to commit idolatry at the bidding of the king; and in that of Daniel, refusing to omit his prayers in obedience to the decree of Darius; and in that of the Apostles, refusing to desist from preaching at the command of the Jewish rulers. In all such cases as these we must say with the Apostles, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts v. 29; iv. 19). We must obey men for the sake of God, but we must not disobey God for the sake of men.

3. In England, the supreme human authority, under Christ, over all persons, spiritual as well as temporal, and in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, is vested in the Sovereign. This is affirmed by the Church of England in her Articles (Art. xxxvii.), (which were agreed upon by the Church in Convocation,) and also in her Canons (Canons 1, 2). Therefore they who appeal to the authority of the *Church* and to her *Canon Law*, are bound to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy, properly understood; and he that resists that authority in anything which is not plainly repugnant to the law of God, not only resists the law of the State, but of the *Church;* he *resists God*, from Whom all the authority of rulers and laws is derived.

4. In the realm of England, the laws of the land are the laws of the sovereign. They have no validity before they receive the royal assent. In the words of Bishop Sanderson (in his seventh lecture on Conscience and on the efficient cause of human Law), "Our laws in England are called the *King's Laws*, because the kings of England are the fountains of law and justice, and because God has bestowed upon them a sovereign imperial power, by which they give a force to the laws themselves, and cause them to be received as such."

And this is not only the case with regard to laws concerning *civil* matters, but also with respect to *laws ecclesiastical*, as the same author reminds us in the same lecture. The

Canons framed by the Church in her Convocations and Synods "have no obligatory force, till they receive the assent of the Sovereign, by whose public authority as soon as they are confirmed, they immediately pass into a law, and oblige the conscience of the subject."

5. It is not indeed to be imagined, that Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England *derive* their authority to preach or to minister the sacraments, from *any human source*. No; they derive it from Christ, and from Christ alone, Who is supreme over all human authority; and from Whom all authority comes. But the designation of the *places* in which (such as dioceses and parishes), their divinely appointed authority is to be *exercised and applied* by Bishops and Clergy, and the *external* jurisdiction by which that authority is supported, are from the laws of the Realm, and from the supreme human authority in it.

6. Not only *all Laws* in England which have any co-active authority, whether civil or ecclesiastical, are acknowledged by our greatest theologians to be the Laws of the Sovereign; but all *Courts*, whether ecclesiastical or civil, are, strictly speaking, *the Queen's Courts*.[1]

This is distinctly stated in the statute of the first year of King Edward the Sixth, in these words, "all Courts Ecclesiastical are kept by no other authority than that of the King's most excellent Majesty," and this is fully set forth in Bishop Sanderson's treatise, "on Episcopacy not prejudicial to Royal Power," (p. 47, ed. Lond., 1673, or in Bishop Jacobson's edition, vol. v., p. 162), to which I beg to refer.[1]

7. Let me now apply these principles to the question which you have submitted to me.

I am of opinion that in framing laws which concern the Clergy and their public ministrations, it is desirable that the Temporal Power should avail itself of the counsel of Bishops and Clergy in Provincial Synods, duly convened under royal authority, according to the principle laid down in the celebrated statute of appeals (24 Hen. VIII. c. 12).

For the better framing of such laws, and for the readier acceptance of them by the Clergy, such a course is certainly

[1] See the notes at the end of this letter, pp. 150—154.

very expedient, and I stated as much in the Parliamentary debates on the Public Worship Regulation Bill, on April 28th and June 4th, 1874, in the House of Lords, and also in a tract then published by me, entitled "*Senates and Synods.*" (See above, pp. 125—130, 132—135.)

The question, however, raised in your letter to me, is not, —Whether the "Public Worship Regulation Act" would not have been a much better measure, if it had been passed with the consent of the Church in her Convocations,—but the question is, Whether the decisions of the Court of Arches, as modified by that Act, have *no spiritual validity*, and ought to be resisted by the Clergy?

And here let us refer to our history. The Second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth and the Prayer Book of Elizabeth were put forth by the Crown, with the advice of certain Bishops and Divines, and with the authority of Parliament, but not of Convocation. The additions to the Church Catechism, and other changes in the Prayer Book in the reign of King James the First, did not receive the assent of Convocation till *after* their promulgation by the Crown (see Canon 80). The use of our Authorized Version of the Bible of 1611 does not rest on the sanction of Convocation. The Legislative measures which have altered the constitution and condition of our Cathedral Churches, and the "Church Discipline Act," have been passed without Synodical sanction.

These are examples of anomalies which we reasonably regret; and we shall do well to endeavour to prevent their recurrence by all well-considered measures in our power; especially by reference to the action of the House of Commons with regard to the "*Comprehension Bill*" in 1689 (see above, p. 132).

Again, the question which is raised in the letter which you have sent me, is whether sentences of suspension or inhibition pronounced by the Court of Arches, as recently modified by the Public Worship Regulation Act, are "*spiritually null and void;*" and whether it be right to encourage the Clergy of the Church of England to "continue to discharge their spiritual functions," notwithstanding such sentences, by assuring them not only of sympathy, but of

"such support and assistance as the circumstances of the case might demand."

The precise meaning of the word *spiritually* in this proposition is not clear; it may signify what appertains to the *Church* as distinct from the State, and be equivalent to *ecclesiastical;* or it may mean what is divine, and affects the *conscience.*

Let us consider it in both these senses.

The Court in question is an *Ecclesiastical* Court, it is the Court of the Province, in which a Judge sits who is delegated by the *Metropolitan.*

The Court of Arches is also one of the Queen's Courts; and has been constituted by a legislative enactment, which is one of the Queen's laws; and the Queen's Majesty is acknowledged by the Church of England to be supreme, under God, over all persons, spiritual as well as temporal, and in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil. Accordingly, ever since the Reformation in the 16th century, there has been an Appeal to the Crown in all causes, spiritual or ecclesiastical; and not only so, but every Priest of the Church of England solemnly pledged himself in the House of God, at his ordination to the priesthood, to "minister the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this *Church and Realm* hath received the same."

We may, or we may not, regard this state of things as satisfactory. It has, I think, its imperfections in practice, as all earthly things have. But, my dear friend, we need not hesitate to prefer our own system of Church Government to other systems; such, for example, as the Papal, where all authority, human and Divine, is subjected to the will of one man; or the Puritan, where, under a professed zeal for the royalties of Christ, all is made subservient to consistories of human invention; or the Erastian, where Divine law is to give way to the human will; or to the still more modern theory of Government, where everything is at the mercy of popular plebiscites. And the ecclesiastical system of "*disestablished churches,*" as far as we have seen it, is not very happy in its results. Perhaps some of those, who now court Disestablishment, would be the first to rue it.

But after all we must remember, this is not the question. The question is whether we, the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, who have been admitted to our offices and benefices under certain conditions freely accepted by ourselves, are at liberty to violate those conditions, and then to claim a right to hold those offices and benefices.

Such a course seems to be at variance with the duty which we owe, as Clergymen, to the Church.

And now suppose it to be alleged, that the Court in question cannot by any of its judgments oblige our consciences to obedience. Let me answer again, in the words of Bishop Sanderson, that "temporal authority may have a spiritual effect derived to it from the power of some superior cause under which it acts. A magistrate, when he justly executes his legislative power which God has put into his hands, acts by virtue of a divine authority, and by the appointment of God, Who is a spirit, and Who, as the Lord and Father of spirits, has sovereign authority over the spirits of men." (*Bishop Sanderson*, Lecture 5.) Here the words of the Apostle apply, "We must needs be subject not only for wrath (*i.e.* for fear of punishment) but for *conscience* sake." (Rom. xiii. 5.)

To resist such authority, in things which are not clearly contrary to the Divine Law, is to resist God; and such an offence is greater in the Clergy, who have pledged themselves to be subject to the Sovereign as "supreme over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical and civil;" and who are bound to teach others by example as well as by precept "to be subject to principalities and powers, and to obey magistrates. (Titus iii. 13.)

8. When also a Clergyman, who has solemnly promised at his ordination to obey his Ordinary (*i. e.* the Bishop of the Diocese), is commanded by his Bishop, in the exercise of his Episcopal authority, to submit to the decisions of the Court of Arches, as now constituted, I confess that I cannot understand how, in such a case, "the decisions of the Court have *no spiritual validity*," but on the contrary, a Clergyman who sets them at defiance, appears to be

openly despising and resisting both temporal and spiritual authority.

9.—It may indeed be alleged by some well-meaning persons that such clergymen are *suffering persecution,* and have claims to sympathy and support, But the fact is, such clergymen are *not martyrs, but persecutors.* They are persecuting the Church of which they are ministers, by disturbing its peace, and by stirring up strife, and by spreading confusion and anarchy, and by marring its efficacy, and imperilling its safety.

As was observed long ago by St. Augustine, such persons are like Agar and Ishmael, who complained of persecution, but who persecuted Sarah and Isaac. (Galat. iv. 29.)

10.—The "resolution" you have sent me pledges all who vote for it, to give to those, who resist the authority of the Court of Arches, "such support and assistance as the circumstances of the case may demand."

In other words, it will bind them not only to help in defraying the legal expenses of such clergymen as may resist those decisions, but also to provide maintenance for them and their families during suspension and after deprivation.

This may be a very serious matter; but it vanishes into insignificance when compared with the consequences of the separation of pastors from their flocks, and of the disruption of the Church of England, and of all the calamitous results of such a disruption, moral and religious, not only to the Church but to the Nation.

11.—Such a resolution must, if carried, lead its supporters much further.

They who resist the decisions of the Court of Arches on the grounds alleged by them, must by parity of reasoning proceed also to resist the authority of the Final Court of Appeal, namely, the *Judicial Committee of Privy Council,* which has succeeded the Court of Delegates, and has been constituted by legislative enactments, without the advice or assent of the Church. Indeed, this is already avowed by some among them. And, my dear friend, who can foresee what will be the end of such a conflict as this?

12.—In writing thus, I shall not be supposed to say that our present system of Ecclesiastical Judicature, and our present mode of legislating on ecclesiastical and religious questions, are not open to serious objections, and do not require amendment. On the contrary, I fully admit the force of much that is pleaded in both these respects. I am of opinion that *for the sake of the State*, as well as for that of the Church, more liberty ought to be given to the Church, and more importance be attached to the judgment of the Spiritualty in Ecclesiastical causes, and to the action of the Church of England in her Synods, diocesan and provincial, so that she may be recognized in her authentic character, as grounded on Holy Scripture, interpreted by the consent and practice of the ancient Catholic Church.

Greater security ought also to be given than is now the case, for the proper exercise of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction by a better constitution of Church Courts.

But we shall never obtain these benefits by violent resistance to constituted authorities. On the contrary, by such resistance we shall provoke violent reprisals, and greatly injure the cause we desire to maintain.

13.—And here let us consider the example of our blessed Lord Himself and His Apostles. Their days were evil days for the ancient Hebrew Church of God. Bad men sat in high places, civil and ecclesiastical. And yet our Lord commanded His disciples to obey them in all matters not contrary to God's law. (Matthew xxiii. 2.) The Hebrew High Priesthood, instituted by God Himself, was no longer hereditary for life, but High Priests were made and unmade by the heathen power of Rome. Yet our Lord communicated with them in the Temple, and pleaded before them; and His Apostle St. Paul stood at the Tribunal of one of the worst of that number, and owned him as the ruler of God's people, and corrected himself for speaking evil of him. (Acts xxiii. 4, 5.) And he pleaded, in a cause of religion, even before Felix, and before Agrippa, and Festus. (Acts xxv. xxvi.)

14.—No age of the Church can be mentioned, in which there have not been many flaws and blemishes in the rela-

tions of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. But the way to remove them is not by disobeying God in resistance to lawful authority, but by judicious remedial measures, and by doing our own duties in our respective callings, and by improving the Diocesan and Parochial system of the Church of England, especially in our large towns; and by diffusing her benign influence in the hearts of the population, so that by their means acting on the Legislature, wise and wholesome Laws may be enacted, and the spiritual and temporal Authorities may move in harmonious concert for the promotion of the Divine glory, in obedience to the Divine Will and Word, for the honour of the Crown of England, for the peace and stability of the Church, and for the safety and prosperity of the Realm.

I am, my dear Canon Hole, yours affectionately,

C. Lincoln.

The Rev. Canon Hole, Rural Dean,
Caunton Manor, Newark-on-Trent.

The following is from Bishop Sanderson, *On Episcopacy, &c.*, pages 26—35, ed. Lond. 1673. Bishop Sanderson's authority in the Convocation and Church of England was evinced by his being appointed to write the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer, at the last revision of it:—

The *Ministerial Power* (in the Church) is that which is common to Bishops with their fellow-Presbyters, viz. the Preaching of the Word, and the Administration of the Sacraments; and is confessed to be *from heaven, and of God.*

And yet no prejudice is at all conceived to be done thereby to the regal power; because the Ministers, who exercise that power, are the King's subjects, and are also, in the executing of those very acts, that are proper to their ministerial functions, to be limited and ordered by the *Ecclesiastical Laws,* i.e. by such Laws as have been by regal power established in this realm.

The King doth no more challenge to himself, as belonging

to him by virtue of his Supremacy Ecclesiastical, the power of ordaining Ministers, excommunicating scandalous offenders, or doing any other act of Episcopal office in his own power, than he doth the power of Preaching, administering the Sacraments, or doing any other act of Ministerial Office in his own person; but he leaveth the performance of all such acts, of either sort, unto such persons as the said several respective powers do of divine right belong unto; viz. of the one sort to a *Bishop*, and of the other to *all Priests*.

All power, to the exercise whereof our Bishops have pretended, cometh under one of the two heads; of *Order*, or of *Jurisdiction*.

The power of *Order* consisteth partly in Preaching the Word, and other Offices of Public Worship, common to them with their fellow-ministers; partly in Ordaining Priests and Deacons, admitting them to their Sacred Cures, and other things of like nature, peculiar to them alone; and is of divine right.

The power of *Jurisdiction* is either *internal*, in retaining and remitting sins, *in foro conscientiæ*, common to them also, for the *substance* of the authority, though with some difference of *degree*, with other ministers; or *external*, for the outward government of the Church in some parts thereof, peculiar to them alone.

That *external* power is either *directive* in prescribing rules and orders to those under their jurisdictions, and making *Canons* and *Constitutions* to be observed by the Church; wherein the inferior Clergy, by their representatives in *Convocation*, have their voice, as well as the Bishops; and both dependently upon the King; for they cannot either meet without the writ, or treat without his commission, or establish without his royal assent.

Or it is *judiciary* and *coercive* in giving sentence, *in foro exteriori*, in matters of Ecclesiastical cognizance.

Of these powers some branches, not only in the exercise thereof, but even in the very substance of the power itself (as, namely, that of *external jurisdiction coercive*), are by the Laws declared, and by the Clergy acknowledged to be wholly

and entirely derived from the King, as the sole fountain of all Authority of external Jurisdiction, whether spiritual or temporal, within the realm.—*Bishop Sanderson.*

Richard Hooker, Laws of Eccl. Polity, viii. 8, thus writes, "As the person of the King may for just considerations, even where the cause is *civil*, be notwithstanding withdrawn from the seat of judgment, and others *under his authority* be fit, he unfit himself, to judge; so the considerations for which it were haply not convenient for kings to sit and give sentence in *spiritual courts*, where causes ecclesiastical are usually debated, can be no bar to that force and efficacy, which their sovereign power hath *over* those very consistories, and for which we hold without *any exception that all Courts are the King's.*"

And see *Bishop Andrewes,* Tortura Torti, p. 380, where is probably the clearest and most comprehensive statement of the nature, offices, and limits of the exercise of the Royal Supremacy.

The whole may be summed up as follows:—

1. All authority is from God alone.

2. In England, the Sovereign is, under God, "supreme over all persons, spiritual and temporal; and in all causes, Ecclesiastical and Civil."

3. The Sovereign is the Fountain of Justice.

All Courts, strictly speaking, are Courts of the Sovereign, and derive authority, as far as it is *external* and *co-active*, from the Sovereign.

4. The Sovereign dispenses justice, in Diocesan Courts, by the Bishop of the Diocese, who has been accustomed to delegate his authority to the Chancellor of the Diocese.

5. The Sovereign dispenses justice, in the Court of the Province, by the Metropolitan, who has delegated his authority to the Dean of the Court of Arches.

6. The Sovereign, finally, receives Appeals in Ecclesiastical Causes, in the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, which has *no power of deciding* causes, and does *not pronounce any judicial sentence,* but *gives advice* on the causes brought before it to the Sovereign, who, after hearing the advice of her Councillors and Prelates, pronounces final

sentence thereupon in person—in Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Bishop Andrewes thus writes, page 365, "There ought to be conjunction between the Realm and the Church, but not confusion. As they have distinct causes, so they ought to have separate Courts; but the Church, not less than the Realm, ought to hold her Courts under the King, by whose authority Judges preside; Amariah in the Courts of the Church, Zebadiah in the Courts of the Realm (see 2 Chron. xix. 11), but both by command of the King."

Bishop Stillingfleet thus writes (Ecclesiastical Cases, ii. 99):—"As in temporal matters the King's supreme authority is exercised in his ordinary Courts, so likewise in *Ecclesiastical* Courts, which derive their *jurisdiction* from the King as supreme." Bishop Stillingfleet uses the term *jurisdiction*, because (in the words of *Bishop Andrewes*, Tortura Torti, p. 380) "we do not attribute to the King the *power* of *the Keys*, i.e. of *spiritual censures* and *excommunication*;" but we, as *Francis Mason* says (de Minister. Angl. iii. c. 3, p. 271), hold that the "King may command those, who have that power, to *use* it *rightly*."

In the above quotations from Bishop Sanderson, Richard Hooker, Bishop Andrewes, and Bishop Stillingfleet, we have the opinions of our greatest divines of the 16th and 17th centuries.

Let me add some testimonies of eminent Laymen.

King Charles I. (in his First Paper at the Isle of Wight) thus speaks:—"In former times, under *Pagan* Princes, the Church was a distinct body of itself, divided from the Commonwealth, and was governed by its own rulers." He proceeds to exemplify this by reference to the acts of Christian Bishops in those times, and then goes on to say:—"After that the Church, under *Christian* Princes, began to be incorporated in the Commonwealth (whereupon there must of necessity follow a complication of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers); the *jurisdiction* of Bishops, in the *outward* exercise of it, was subordinate unto and limitable by the supreme Civil Power, and hath been, and is at this day, so acknowledged by the Bishops of the realm."

Chief Justice Coke (4 Inst. 321):—"Those who have spiritual jurisdiction, as Archbishops and Bishops, are the *King's Judges.*"

Lord Chancellor Clarendon (Religion and Policy, Introduction, pp. 1—7):—"Our Kings cannot prescribe what Laws they please contrary to the law of Nature and of God, so they cannot impose what religion they please contrary to what He hath enjoined; but the way to propagate the same is committed to the Sovereign Power, to provide for the peace of Church and State."

Sir Roger Twysden, in his learned Vindication of the English Reformation, says, p. 115:—"When we say that the Prince as the principal, without whom nothing is done, may be rightly termed head in the act of reformation, our meaning is not that he will deal in points of Ecclesiastical cognizance without the advice of his Bishops and other learned of the Clergy; we know in things proper, Joshua is to take counsel of Eleazar (Num. xxvii. 21), and the Kings of this nation have ever done so."

DIOCESAN SYNODS, AND DIOCESAN CONFERENCES.

A Diocesan Synod was held in the Cathedral Church of Lincoln on the 20th of September, 1871.[1]

The memorial which I received from more than four hundred and thirty of the clergy of the diocese requesting me to hold a Diocesan Synod, led me to consider carefully what the right constitution of a Diocesan Synod is, and what is the proper manner and order of holding such a Synod, and what are the rules for its proceedings, and the functions to be discharged by it.

Happily some learned treatises have been written on Diocesan Synods, which much lighten our labour, and may give us clear views with respect to them. I refer especially to the works of Lambertini,[2] Gavanti,[3] Thomassinus,[4] Van Espen,[5] Martené,[6] La Luzerne,[7] and others; and, especially in our own country, the chapters on Diocesan Synods in the "Reformatio Legum," drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer

[1] The Acts of the Synod may be seen in the Lincoln Diocesan Calendar for 1872, p. 101.

[2] "De Synodo Diœcesanâ libri tredecim," 2 vols. 4to. Ferrar, 1760. This work may also be found in Migne's "Theologiæ Cursus Completus," tom. xxv. p. 801. Paris, 1840.

[3] Gavanti, "B. Praxis exactissima Diœcesanae Synodi;" Aug. Vind., 1763, in his "Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum," tom. iii. This is the most complete work on the constitution and proceedings of Diocesan Synods.

[4] Thomassinus, "Vetus et Nova Eccl. Disciplina," pars ii. lib. iii. cap. 63, vol. vi. p. 555, ed. Mogunt. 1787.

[5] Van Espen, "Jus Eccles." pars i. tit. xviii. p. 105, ed. Colon, 1748.

[6] Martené, "De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus," lib. iii. cap. i. tom. ii. p. 311.

[7] De la Luzerne, "Droits et Devoirs des Évêques et des Prêtres," Paris, 1844.

and his associates in the reign of King Edward VI.,[8] and in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the writings of Dr. Field,[9] Archbishop Wake,[1] Bishop Kennett, and the

[8] "Ref. Legum," cap. 19—23, "The work and words were mainly Cranmer's own."—Strype's "Cranmer," p. 134.

[9] Dean Field on the "Church," p. 508.

[1] Archbishop Wake on the "State of the Church." Lond. 1703, pp. 23, 24. He writes as follows:—"The Diocesan Synods of the Bishops and Clergy, of every Diocess, by their joynt counsel and authority (committed to them by Christ) order'd the affairs of their respective Diocesses before any other Councils were settled, or assembled in the Church.—

"That the Bishop of every Diocess has, by Divine Commission, a power to govern the Church of Christ, over which he is placed; and in order thereunto, to call together the Presbyters which minister under him, was the constant sense of all the ancient Councils and Fathers of the Church. They have not only allow'd of this power, but have directed the exercise of it, and commanded the Bishop, from time to time, to put it in execution.

How often every Bishop was obliged to assemble his Diocesan Synod, the Canons of the Church inform us:* which generally ordained that these Councils should be held at least once every year, and obliged the Clergy, under the severest penalties, to appear at them. In the ancient formulary for holding of these Synods † among us, the order is, that they should be convened twice in the year; and this seems to have then been the ancient measure of them. The Synod of Calcyth‡ settled it betimes here; and if we may rely upon the Worcester copy of the Synod of Winchester, anno 1076,§ we must look upon this to have there again had a public determination. 'Tis true in the Cotton MS. the decree is more general; that every Bishop should hold a Synod every year, and yet, above 200 years after, in the Constitutions of the Bishop of Durham,|| anno 1312, the proportion of two yearly Synods was not only established as a rule for that Bishoprick, but was said to have been established according to the Canonical Sanctions, which therefore seem to have yet continued in a general force among us. But the common direction of the Canon Law ¶ was to have such Synods held once in the year; and this Lynwood ** seems to deliver as the rule of our Church too; and there is this reason to believe that by this time it was become so, that when the

* See Spelman, Concil. vol. ii. p. 1.

† Concil. Antissiod. Ann. 571, Can. 7.

‡ Spelm. Conc. tom. i. p. 293, Can. 3, Ann. 787.

§ Apud Spelm. Ib. p. 12.

|| Spelm. Concil. vol. ii. p. 436, cap. 3.

¶ Dist. 18, c. 16, 18, q. 2, c. Abbates, Concil. Arelat. vi. can. 4.

** Provincial, lib. i. tit. 14, De Maj. and Ob. cap. Item statuimus, *Voce* Synodis.

great work of Wilkins,[2] containing the acts of Diocesan and other Synods in England from the earliest times; to which

Reformation was made of the Ecclesiastical Canons, then in force in this Church,* this was the Proportion which we find was intended to have been continued by those, to whom the review of those Canons was committed.

"To this Synod all the Clergy who had any Benefice within the Diocess, were obliged to come: † and so were the Regulars too, as well Abbots as Monks; excepting only those who, in process of time, were exempted from the Episcopal Jurisdiction. And even those,‡ if they had any Benefices, by reason whereof they became subject to the Authority of the Bishop, were obliged upon the account of such their Benefices to come likewise. In the Constitutions of the Bishop of Durham,§ the Members of these Synods are thus computed: Abbots, Priors, Archdeacons, Provosts, Vicars, and Parochial Chaplains: and that this was nothing peculiar to that Diocess, the Reformation of our Ecclesiastical Law || shews, which was gathered out of the Canon Laws, then in practice among us; and (omitting only the Regulars, who were now suppress'd) enumerates the rest much after the same manner, the Bishop with his Presbyters, Parochial Ministers, Vicars and Clerks.

"The first thing that was usually done on these occasions, was for the Bishop to make his Synodical Enquiries; ¶ of which the ancient forms still remain to us. Then the Synodical causes were heard. Every one who had any proper complaint to make, was permitted to speak; and for this end, not only the Clergy, but the Laity too, were suffered to be present at these Synods, and to speak in them.

"In these Synods, the Bishop was wont to declare to his Clergy what had been decreed in the Larger Synods of the Province: ** In these, he was directed to charge his Clergy to have a care of their Ministry, and to lay before them the main branches of that Duty, which was incumbent upon them in their respective places to fulfil.

"And lastly, in these Synods, the Bishop published his own Diocesan Constitutions: †† which being read, and agreed to by the Synod, were

---

* Reformat. Leg. Eccles., De Eccles. and Ministr. Ejus. cap. 20.

† Capitul. vol. i. col. 171. Synod. Vernens. cap. 8. Lynwood, l.c. *Voce* Synodis.

‡ Concil. Antissiod. can. vii. Synod. Mogunt. 1, can. xiv.

§ Ubi supr. cap. 3. || Loc. sup. cit. cap. 10.

¶ Vid. Not. Baluz. in Reg. p. 531, 532. Reform. Legg. Eccl. l.c. cap. 22. Vid. Ord. Rom., Bibl. PP. tom. 13, p. 742, 743. Spelm. Concil. vol. ii. p. 1, 2, &c. Ord. MS. in Bibl. Cott. Tiberius, c. 1.

** Dist. xviii. Epist. Bonifac. ad Cuthbert. Arch. apud Spelm. t. 1, p. 238. Lynwood, de Consuet. lib. i. tit. 3, cap. Hujus autem, p. 18, b. Ord. Rom. loc. supr. cit. Baluz. in Reg. p. 532. Ord. Spelm. tom. 2, p. 1. Ord. MS. supr.

†† Leo iv. Epist. ad Episc. Britanniæ, apud Labb. Concil. tom. 8, col. 31.

may be added some excellent treatises[3] on this subject, which have appeared in our own time.

from thenceforth of force within the Diocess; provided they were not contrary to what had been decreed in some superiour Council of the Province. Of these we have several collections already published in the volumes of our Councils, and many more there are still remaining in the Registers of our Churches, which witness the same to us.

"How they proceeded in the celebration of these Synods, the ancient Orders framed for the holding of them, inform us. The Clergy in solemn Procession came to the Church where they were to meet, at the day and hour appointed by the Bishop, and sate according to the time of their Ordination.* Then the Deacons and Laity (even women not excepted) were admitted. The Bishop (or, in his absence, his Vicar) being come in, and the stated Prayers ended; made a solemn exhortation to them. Then (by the Roman Order) a Sermon was to be preach'd; after which, if any Clergyman had any complaint to make, or anything else to offer, he was heard by the Synod.

"The Complaints of the Clergy being over, the Laity, in the next place, were permitted to make theirs. Then the Bishop proposed his Diocesan Constitutions to them. After which, if nothing further remain'd to be done, a large Synodical Exhortation, in the way of an Injunction, to his Clergy; and so all concluded with solemn Prayers suited to the Business for which they were assembled.

"For the Despatch of all this, the common time allow'd, was Three or Four days: and a several Rubric was Establish'd to direct the proceeding in every one of them. But if the Business of the Synod could be done in lesser time, the Assembly was to be continued no longer than was necessary for the finishing the Affairs that came before it.

"Such was the Nature of these Councils; which accordingly were continued in Use among us to the time of King Henry ths Eighth. The Names by which they were called were various, sometimes *Concilium Episcopi* and *Concilium Episcopale* from the Authority which the Bishop had, both to call and to preside in them."

[2] "Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ," 4 vols. folio. London, 1737. See there, i. p. 7; iv. pp. 228, 537, 608.

[3] Particularly the learned work entitled "England's Sacred Synods," by the Rev. James Wayland Joyce. London, 1855. Also the Letter of the late Chancellor Massingberd ("Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln on a Diocesan Synod," 1869), and the "Paper on Diocesan Synods," by a person to whom the Synod of this Province, and the Church of England, owe a deep debt of gratitude, the Ven. Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury, and Dean of Lichfield. London, 1867.

Ord. Rom. in Pontificali, lib. iii. fol. 189, Edit. Venet. An. 1561. Lyndwood, de Appell. i. 1, 2, tit. 7, cap. In Consilio, verb. statutum, Francisc. Leo prax. for. Eccl. par. 2. cap. 9, sect. 15.

* Vid. Ord. MSS. Bibl. Cotton. supr. cit.

It will be evident from the examination of such works as these, that Diocesan Synods were among the earliest[4] Councils of the Christian Church. They were more ancient than Provincial Synods. A Diocese is prior to a Province, which is a group of dioceses. Some have recognized an image of a Diocesan Synod in the Acts of the Apostles,[5] where we see St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, and all the elders with him, offering their fraternal counsel to St. Paul. For many centuries Diocesan Synods rendered great service to Christendom. In the Latin Church, as Roman Catholic writers themselves deplore,[6] they have been paralyzed by various influences—especially by the growth of the Roman papacy. The Roman Pontiff aspires to be the Universal Bishop, and claims the world for his diocese; and now that the attribute of personal infallibility has been ascribed to him,[7] it may well be asked, What can be the use of a Diocesan Council, or any other, to advise with him, or to give authority to his decrees? In our own Church Diocesan Synods (properly so called), have not been held recently.[8]

[4] Lambertini, i. p. 7; Thomassinus, vi. p. 522; Bishop Kennett, "Eccl. Synods," ii. p. 254.

[5] Acts xxi. 18; Lambertini, i. p. 6.

[6] Gavanti, p. 2. Although by the Council of Trent (sess. 24, cap. 2) Bishops are required to hold Synods annually, "quod heu! negligitur," says Gavanti.

[7] In the Vatican Council, on July 18, 1870.

[8] The Synod held at Exeter, on June 25 and 26, 1851, which consisted merely of delegates, could hardly be called a Diocesan Synod in the proper sense of the term, as will hereafter appear.

Its proceedings are described in the "Ecclesiastical Gazette" for July, 1851, p. 14. In the same volume, p. 62, may be seen a legal opinion condemning them: but if any one imagines that Bishops are estopped by the Act of Submission, 23 Henry VIII., c. 10, which relates to *Provincial Convocations*, from holding Diocesan Synods without the Royal Writ, he may refer to subsequent Acts—28 Henry VIII., c. 10, sect. 4; 31 Henry VIII., c. 14; 2 & 3 Edw. VI. c. 1.—where Diocesan Synods are supposed to be held; and the Canons of 1603, Can. cxix., and to the Chapters in the *Reformatio Legum*, framed in Edward VI.'s reign, *prescribing* Diocesan Synods to be held yearly. The whole question is well treated by Mr. Joyce in his Sacred Synods, p. 40. See also "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, vol. cxvi. 3rd Series, pp. 419—425, where Lord Russell, then Prime Minister, expressed the same opinion, viz. that the

Who are the persons that have a right to be convened to a Diocesan Synod?

To this question it may be replied, that all Priests and Deacons,[9] exercising ministerial functions in a diocese, are entitled to a place in a Diocesan Synod.[1] "Let nothing be done without the Bishop"[2] was a maxim of the Primitive Church. But "let not the Bishop act without his presbyters" was a rule of equal authority.[3] The beautiful simile of one of St. John's disciples—St. Ignatius, the Bishop and Martyr of Antioch—happily combines these precepts in one: "Let the presbyters be joined together with the Bishop, as the chords of a harp, to make sweet music to God."[4]

It is true that in some cases, on account of penalties levied on presbyters for not appearing at a Diocesan Synod, they claimed a right to send proxies;[5] but it is a principle laid down by the best writers on the subject, that a Council formed by a process of delegation cannot rightly be called a Diocesan Synod.

With regard to the Laity, it appears that they also were invited to Diocesan Synods, which had a judicial as well as deliberative character, and were Ecclesiastical Courts, as well as Church Councils. The purpose for which the laity were called, was that they might state grievances, or, in modern ecclesiastical language, "make presentments" of those things which required amendment in their parishes.[6]

Act of Submission did not relate to Diocesan Synods, which have never at any time been convened by the King's Writ, but were always called together by the Bishop. Diocesan Synods have been summoned and held by English Bishops since the Reformation, and Canons been promulged in them.

[9] As to the presence of deacons, see Thomassinus, p. 515; Martené, lib. iii. cap. i. pp. 312—314. Not all deacons, but some who were specially chosen, were admitted. Thomassinus, p. 522.

[1] See Van Espen, p. 106; Thomassinus, pp. 517—519; Lambertini, pp. 81—100; Gavanti, pp. 3, 4.

[2] S. Ignat. "ad Magnes." c. 4 and c. 7; Trall. c. 4 and c. 7; Smyrn. c. 8 and c. 9; Phil. c. 8.

[3] Cp. S. Ignat. "ad Eph." c. 4 and c. 5; Trall. c. 7.

[4] S. Ignat. "ad Eph." c. 4.

[5] Van Espen, p. 105; Gavanti, p. 23.

[6] Gavanti, pp. 8—11; Van Espen, p. 106. When the Synod lasted

We may recognize a remnant of this usage in the word "Sidesmen," or "Synodsmen," the ancient "testes Synodales," and in the functions which these lay officers of the Church may lawfully perform in episcopal and archidiaconal Visitations; which still preserve some vestiges of ancient Diocesan Synods.

These are the things which are the proper matters to be treated of in Diocesan Synods,[7] in their *deliberative* character. The sacredness of the subjects appointed for their consideration was indicated by the name given to the Synod, which was called a "sacred assembly:" and by the place in which the Synod was held—usually the Cathedral Church,—and even by the sacred attire[8] of those who were assembled in it.

The proper place of the laity is in other Church Councils, not less useful, but of a different kind, namely, *Diocesan Conferences;* of which we shall speak hereafter. Let *Diocesan Synods* be kept distinct from *Diocesan Conferences;*[9] let there be no confusion between them; let the clergy do their proper work, and the laity theirs; then we shall tread safely in the ancient paths, while at the same time we adjust ourselves to the requirements of modern times.

These conclusions will appear still more reasonable when we proceed to examine more closely the proper mode of proceeding in Diocesan Synods, and the peculiar functions to be performed by them.

three days the "querelæ laicorum" were listened to on the second day. Cp. Lambertini, pp. 113—117; and Dean Field on the "Church," p. 508; and Wilkins' "Concilia," iv. p. 784.

[7] "Diœcesana Synodus est congregatio legitima, quam facit Episcopus cum clericis sibi subditis, in suâ diœcesi, de iisque in eâ tractat, quæ curæ suæ pastorali incumbunt."—Gavanti, p. 1.

[8] The Bishop was to be in his Episcopal dress, the clergy in surplices.—Gavanti, pp. 19, 23, 25; Thomassinus, p. 524; Lambertini, i. pp. 124—128.

[9] The words of Thomassinus, "De Synodo Diœcesanâ" (p. 520) deserve careful attention: "Plures habes conventus ab Episcopis convocatos" (Diocesan Conferences) "in quibus et laicis locus erat, potissimum verò nobilibus, quo et hi conventus *distabant a Synodis*," where (he adds) the laity did not take a deliberative part.

The holding of a Diocesan Synod was a holy work. It was a solemn act of religious worship, performed by the Bishop and Clergy of the diocese in the Church of God. In it they joined in the profession of the same faith—in the Nicene Creed; in it they sang praises to God—in the "Te Deum," and in certain Psalms appointed for the purpose;[1] in it they invoked the aid of the Holy Ghost—in the "Veni Creator;" in it they were united together at the Holy Communion.

One of the duties of a Diocesan Synod was to make known and promulge canons and constitutions which had been already agreed upon in the Provincial Council.[2]

Another use of a Diocesan Synod was to give authoritative utterance and public assent to what, after the Bishop had previously taken counsel with elder and graver presbyters of the diocese,[3] especially with the Capitular Body—the "Senatus Episcopi"—had approved itself to his judgment.

These being the principal functions of a Diocesan Synod, it may readily be supposed that in the first sixteen centuries after Christ it never was the custom to bring questions before the Synod for the purpose of eager debate and controversy, and with a view to divisions of the clergy into majorities and minorities. And therefore, though Diocesan Synods sometimes numbered as many as nine hundred presbyters assembled together, yet there was no discord or confusion in them.

During sixteen hundred years after Christ, a Diocesan Synod was called the Synod of the Bishop.[4] The canons and constitutions published therein were said to be promulged by the Bishop. It never occurred to the mind of ancient Christendom, that the Bishops of Christ's Church, seated in their Cathedral Churches, would enter into the lists of controversy with the clergy of their dioceses, divided

[1] Psalm xxxiii., lxvii., lxviii., lxxxiv., lxxxvii., cxxxiii; Gavanti. p, 25.
[2] Van Espen, p. 106.
[3] Lambertini, i. p. 227.
[4] See Van Espen, p. 106; Gavanti, pp. 19, 20; Thomassinus, p. 519; Lambertini, p. 134; ii. pp. 203, 210, 213.

into opposite camps.[5] This was not their view of Episcopacy. In their eyes the Bishop was a Father in God; and while on the one hand it was supposed that the clergy would treat their spiritual father with filial reverence, it was anticipated on the other that he would endeavour to rule with parental love, and that he would not obtrude his own private opinions on a reluctant clergy, but that he would pray fervently to God for grace and guidance, and give himself to diligent study and devout meditation, and would seek to lead the clergy by wise counsels and gentle persuasion to right conclusions; and with their help would embody and concentrate those conclusions in synodical utterances, which would have great force and weight by reason of previous consultation and general subsequent assent.

Few things, we may humbly believe, are more pleasing to the holy angels and to the God of angels, than to see the Clergy of a diocese joined together with the Bishop in prayer, and praise, and Holy Communion, in the Mother Church of the diocese; and, if it may be by God's grace, in the unanimous adoption of such measures as may tend to promote His glory and the eternal salvation of His people.

Such harmonious action as this has, by its very quietness, great power. It shows the Clergy to the world as an united body, and as strong by union. It has the blessed effect of rescuing the matters agreed upon from the atmosphere of party, and of placing them in the calmer light of general consent. Whenever the Clergy of a diocese agree together on the course of action to be taken in any given matter, there is no longer any room for those invidious comparisons between one class of clergy and another, which engender so many heart-burnings and bickerings, and cause so much distraction and weakness, and expose the Church to the derision of her enemies, as a house divided against itself, at a time when the storm is gathering around us, and when we need, if we are to stand, to be firmly built together upon a rock.

There can be little doubt, that if the questions concerning the ritual of the church had been calmly considered by all

[5] Lambertini, ii. p. 196; Thomassinus, p. 517.

the clergy of a Diocese in a Diocesan Synod, and if after careful deliberation they had been decided there, such a decision would have had great moral weight with the Clergy, and a general agreement would have been the result and the painful, tedious and irritating litigation on these questions would have been avoided, which have done so much mischief to the Church.

But in addition to the Diocesan Synod, we need a Diocesan Conference, in which our lay brethren may be associated with us, and in which they may deliberate with us, not on controverted questions of Theology, or on the settled Articles of our Faith, but on various topics which arise from time to time, and vitally affect the interests of religion and the Church.

A Diocesan Synod (as I have already said) has its own peculiar duties to perform; and a Diocesan Conference has its characteristic functions also. The one is distinct from the other, but each may assist the other. Every well-constructed balance has two distinct attributes, stability and sensibility. In our Diocesan constitution, the Synod may be compared to the one,—the Conference to the other. The subjects proposed for consideration in them are different. The matters for the Synod are those which relate to the doctrine, the discipline, and the sacred offices and worship of the Church. The questions for the Conference are of a more mixed character;—such as concern the relation of the Church to the State, the tendency of legislative measures affecting the Church; the endowments of the Church; the maintenance of the Christian ministry; the sustentation of our sacred fabrics, our churchyards, and their services; the building, and maintenance, and efficiency of our Schools; the support of Home and Foreign Missions. A Diocesan Conference, by its composite character and its stirring debates, may ventilate many subjects of interest like these, and by open and animated discussion may prepare matters for Diocesan action.

In order to serve such purposes as these, the Diocesan Conference must be a representative body composed of Clergy and Laity.

Thus, by the blessing of God, a Diocese will possess two distinct Institutions, differing indeed in constitution, and also in their modes of proceeding, but mutually helping one another; the one derived from the earliest ages of Christendom, and consecrated by the venerable prescription of eighteen centuries, and by the time-honoured traditions and historical associations of the Universal Church and of the Church of England,—the DIOCESAN SYNOD;—the other, springing up from the free life of popular Institutions and Representative Government,—the DIOCESAN CONFERENCE. By means of both we may hope to invigorate the old with what is new, and to consolidate the new by what is old; and thus, by not cutting off the entail of the past, but by gladly welcoming the present, and hopefully looking forward to the future, we may combine all ages together, and join them in a cordial embrace of Christian Truth and Christian Love.

Such were the principles on which our Diocesan Synod was constituted, and by which its proceedings were regulated. Many of us, I believe, look back to the day on which it was held, with feelings of devout thankfulness to Almighty God for His presence with us, and for the success which He was pleased to vouchsafe to our endeavours to promote His glory and the good of His Church.

One of the results of the Diocesan Synod was the formation of a *Diocesan Conference*, consisting of an equal number (250) of clergy and laity. Its first meeting was held at Lincoln on the 25th of October, 1872, and proved very successful.

ON THE SALE OF CHURCH PATRONAGE AND SIMONY.

No one, who considers the signs of the times, and is acquainted with the circumstances of the case, can fail to foresee that a severe trial is at hand,—perhaps a violent struggle,—with regard to Church Patronage.

Purchase has been recently abolished in the Army, at a great national sacrifice; and the question is now freely asked,—If promotion in the Army is to depend solely on merit, ought advancement in the Church to be saleable for money? Is the salvation of men's souls of less importance than the protection of their bodies? Are faithful and valiant Soldiers more needed for warfare against foreign foes than against spiritual enemies? Are national conquests more glorious than moral victories? and is it more noble to enlarge the territory of England than to advance the Kingdom of Christ?

The Ecclesiastical history of another part of Great Britain in the present century is fraught with instruction to ourselves.

Church Patronage in Scotland has lately been dealt with by the Imperial Legislature; and by a recent Act of Parliament (37 & 38 Vict. cap. 82. 1874) it has been abolished. Purchase of Ecclesiastical preferments is unknown also in the Free Church of Scotland. Why,—it may be said,—is it allowed and encouraged in England? Are the spiritual interests of the Parishes on this side the Tweed less entitled to the protection of Law than those who dwell on the north of the border? If Church Patronage is to be a marketable commodity in the former case, why not in the latter?

But this is not all, Scotland also teaches us this lesson. If we neglect to adopt measures for a salutary reform in Church Patronage, we may have cause ere long to rue a revolution with regard to it.

Perhaps the wisest thing that was said in the course of a protracted discussion of that grave question, was dictated by the Duke of Wellington in a letter to Lord Aberdeen in 1840.[1]

"What I would recommend (his Grace said) to the Kirk to consider is, that their utility as an Establishment depends in a great measure upon their intimate connexion with the State. They cannot be an Establishment without such a union, *every care being taken to preserve their exclusive spiritual power, and to secure it to them.* But in the exercise of this exclusive power, particularly of those branches thereof which have relation with the municipal power of the State, it is very desirable, and not inconsistent with former practice, that *the Kirk should state clearly the rule which it is proposed to adopt, that that rule should be made the subject of an Act of Parliament, and should regulate all such questions for the future.*"

If this judicious advice had been followed with regard to Patronage, the unhappy disruption, which has now taken place in Scotland, might have been averted. The Patrons might have been maintained in their equitable rights; the spiritual welfare of the People would have been promoted, and the reasonable liberty of the Kirk would have been preserved.

But these wise counsels were disregarded.

In the year 1843, in consequence of a dispute concerning Patronage, the Kirk was rent asunder. The Schism has now become inveterate. The People have triumphed over the Patrons: but, whether the victory has proved a boon to themselves, and whether liberty has not often degenerated into licentiousness, may admit of a doubt. This, however, is certain,—that Patronage, having been abused, is extinguished, even in the Establishment itself.

Here is a warning for England. Let the counsel of the

[1] Earl of Aberdeen's Correspondence, p. 26.

Duke of Wellington not be forgotten. Let the Church declare her laws concerning Patronage, and against Simony, as set forth in Holy Scripture, and in the judgment and practice of the best ages of Christianity, and by our own divines at the Reformation. And let the State give effect to those laws of the Church. In this, as in other matters, the surest and speediest way to arrest Revolution, is by seasonable and salutary Reformation.

Let us now advert to another consideration.

Friendly overtures have recently been made, not without some success, to our Nonconformist brethren, especially to the Wesleyans, with a view to their reunion with ourselves, a consummation earnestly to be wished for the sake of our common Christianity.

They who have taken part in these measures of reconciliation have found, by painful experience, that a barrier is opposed to this reunion by the scandal of the sale and purchase of Church preferments; which would not be tolerated in any dissenting community.

Charges are brought by Nonconformists against Laymen and Clergymen in the Church of England, which cannot be refuted;

> ——————"Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
> Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli."[2]

The "*Ecclesiastical Gazette*" is supposed by many to be an accredited organ of the Church of England. In the pages of that semi-official Periodical is an unblushing display, month after month, of an unholy traffic in spiritual things. There, if we may so speak, the sellers of sheep and oxen exhibit their victims; the money-changers set up their tables, and they who sell doves attract customers in the Temple of God. The Divine Head of the Church, Who, on two occasions—one at the beginning of His Ministry, the other at the close of it[3]—drove the traffickers in sacred things with holy indignation from His presence, and said, "Make not My Father's

[2] Ovid, Met. i. 578.

[3] Matt. xxi. 12, 13. John ii. 14—16. This act of our Blessed Lord has been regarded by the best Expositors of Holy Scripture as expressive of His wrath against Simoniacal traffic in His Church. See, for example, St. Augustine's Comment on John ii. 14—16. Tractat. x. in Joannem.

house an house of merchandize," and "My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves," beholds these things. He marks the Advertisements, in which Clerical Purchasers of Preferment,—Pastors of the Church of Christ,—are tempted by the inducements —not of saving souls and promoting the glory of God, in imitation of the Good Shepherd Who laid down His life for the sheep—but by such allurements as gardens and greenhouses, coach-houses and stables, a comfortable parsonage, and well-kept grounds, with a trout-stream and grammar school for the sons, and with the sea not far off for the wife and daughters, and good society, and a railway station within a mile, and an income of 800*l.* a year; and it is added that the incumbent is 75 years of age, and that the population is small, with light duty.

We are informed that this traffic is increasing.[4]

[4] The evidence of this increase in traffic is given in the following Advertisements transcribed from the "*Ecclesiastical Gazette*" of December, 1873. Similar notices may be seen in the Numbers for January and February, 1874. The CAPITALS are in the original.

"IMPORTANT NOTICE—REMOVAL.—Mr. ——— ——— begs to inform his Clients that, in *consequence of the continued increase of Business* in the varions departments of his Ecclesiastical Offices, he will REMOVE opposite to Larger Offices, &c., from January 1st, 1874."

"THE CHURCH PREFERMENT REGISTER for November—first work of its kind ever issued—contains full and confidential particulars of about ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY ADVOWSONS, PRESENTATIONS, &c., in almost every county and Diocese. For SALE by private treaty. Sent to *bonâ fide* Principals, or their authorized Solicitors, on receipt of three stamps. Address, &c. N.B.—Personal attendance every day (except Saturday) from Ten till Four o'clock."

"MR. ——— OFFICES FOR THE SALE, PURCHASE, AND EXCHANGE OF CHURCH PREFERMENT, &c.

TO PATRONS.—Mr. ——— having on his books the names of over TWO HUNDRED *bonâ fide* Purchasers, will be glad to receive, in confidence, the particulars of ADVOWSONS, NEXT PRESENTATIONS, EPISCOPAL CHAPELS, &c., intended for disposal."

The following is from the Number for February, 1874:—

"The Monthly Register of Church Preferment, for February, contains particulars of a very large number of ADVOWSONS, NEXT PRESENTATIONS, DISTRICT CHURCHES, EPISCOPAL CHAPELS, &c., for Sale, and should be seen by all intending Purchasers. Forwarded on confidential application of Principals, or their Solicitors, in return for two stamps. Apply, &c." So bold is this nefarious traffic become, that

Some persons may say, Why bring these things to light? Why not throw a veil over them? Why encourage obloquy and swell clamour against the Church? I answer, They bring themselves to light, they show themselves openly in noonday. They parade themselves before the eye. To attempt to disguise them is to encourage them. The wounds of the Church will fester unless they are probed. The only remedy is in vigorous and immediate action: —

> Alitur vitium vivitque tegendo,
> Dum medicas adhibere manus ad vulnera Pastor
> Abnegat. . . . .[5]
> Cuncta priùs tentanda; sed immedicabile vulnus
> Ense recidendum.[6]

Besides, even if they could be concealed from human eyes, what would it profit us? He Who is described by the beloved disciple as walking in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks[7]—which are the Churches,[8]—and as marking whether they burn brightly, has His eye upon them, and He will remove the Candlestick of a Church which allows its light to be dimmed by the impurities of worldly corruption. He will stir up against us those who desire our destruction. They who now demand that the Church of England should be disestablished and disendowed, have their best allies in those of the Clergy and Laity, who abet and connive at the sale of spiritual things. The most effective appeals in the speeches of liberationist orators haranguing on popular platforms, and inveighing against the Church of England, are supplied by those Churchmen and Clergymen who sell or purchase preferments for themselves or for their friends and relatives.

Nor is this all. The infidel and the scoffer point with scorn to those Clergy and Laity who profess a reverential zeal for holy things, and yet treat them as articles for sale.

Religious divisions among Christians, and the hostile aggressions of Secularists, and the open assaults of Scepticism and Unbelief gain strength from Simony in the Church.

in the Gazette for March, 1874, and in Dec. 1877, many Advowsons are advertised for sale "with *immediate possession*."

[5] Virg. Georgic. iii. 454.
[6] Ovid, Met. i. 190.
[7] Rev. i. 13.
[8] Rev. i. 20.

We have shut up the Slave-market at Zanzibar, but we have slave-markets of souls in London. Congregations of immortal beings are publicly put up for auction, and are sold to the highest bidder; and the clergyman who has bought them, either directly by his own money, or by some clandestine and oblique subterfuge and evasion (which is known to God, the Searcher of hearts and the Judge of all), comes and presents himself to a Bishop for Institution to the cure of souls, and makes a solemn declaration, that he has "not made, by himself, or by any other person on his behalf, any payment, contract, or promise of any kind whatsoever, which to the *best of his knowledge or belief* is Simoniacal, touching or concerning the obtaining the preferment of ————, and that he will not at any time perform or satisfy in whole or in part any such kind of payment, contract, or promise made by any other without his knowledge or consent."

. . . . . "Sine me hæc haud mollia fando
Sublatis aperire dolis."[9]

These things are done among us, and are said to be on the increase, and are affording a triumph to our enemies, and are provoking God's anger against us.

At the same time it is not fair to say that the fault is with the *Church* herself. Simony is no part of her system. The Canons of the Church strongly and solemnly condemn it. She earnestly protests against it, and endeavours to remove it. If the Church had her will, Simony would not exist. But the misfortune is that temporal laws stifle her voice and restrain her action. And some Laymen and Clergymen are found to use those temporal Laws as instruments of resisting her authority, and sullying the honour and injuring the welfare of the Church, of which they are members and ministers. But the fault is not with her, but with them. This is the condition of the Church in this world. Even among the Apostles was a Judas. "Offences must come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh" (Matt. xviii. 7).

Let it also be remembered, that many of the Clergy and Laity are entangled in the sin of Simony, without being

[9] Virg. Æn. xii. 24.

aware of it. They do not resort to the inspired Word of God, but to law books. They do not go to the House of God, but to chambers in Inns of Court. They do not inquire what Holy Scripture says concerning Simony, or what the Church of God declares with respect to it; but they apply to some professional adviser, or to some clerical agent for the sale of preferments, and they are assured by them that the thing which they desire to do is perfectly legal, and safe, especially if cautious means and circuitous processes are resorted to, and that no detection will ensue. And so their consciences are laid asleep, and they readily and calmly take the above declaration (which, unhappily, has been recently substituted for the solemn oath in the 40th Canon), that they have done nothing "which to the best of their own *knowledge* or *belief* is simoniacal;" it having first been arranged, that the best of their own knowledge should be ignorance; and that their own belief should be a denial of the doctrine of Scripture and the Church concerning the sin of Simony, into which they have been betrayed.

And if it should happen, that after they have committed this sin, their conscience is awakened to a sense of guilt, if by some visitation of God—some blight in their domestic happiness—some solemn and sudden revelation of His wrath —they are bowed down to the dust in sorrow,—then what writhing of soul and agony of heart are theirs! and then how bitterly do they rue the act to which their tempters have beguiled them, and how gladly would they exchange the luxuries of the comfortable parsonage for the privations of an ill-endowed cure, and how thankfully would they imitate the example of that conscience-stricken simoniacal Prelate, Herbert of Thetford (afterwards of Norwich), who laid aside his episcopal ring and crozier, and received them back again after a penitential discipline of self-reproach and self-abasement.[10]

Our temporal laws concerning Patronage and Simony urgently need to be reformed; but even if this were done, yet evasions of them would still be possible.

[10] William of Malmesbury de Gestis Pontif. Anglorum, lib. ii., and see Dean Goulburn's life of Herbert, pp. 88—94. Oxf., 1878.

It may now be asked, What do we mean by Simony?[1]

Simony is so called from Simon, who offered money to the Apostles at Samaria, in order to obtain from them the power of giving the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands,[2] and to whom St. Peter replied, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money; for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee; for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity." And it is clear that St. Peter proceeded to denounce certain judgments upon him from God for his sin, for Simon answered, "Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of these things which ye have spoken come upon me."

At the present time it is alleged by some, that inasmuch as what Simon Magus attempted to do, was to purchase a *spiritual gift*, therefore it is *not* Simony to buy an ecclesiastical *benefice*, to which temporal revenues are annexed.

But to this allegation it may be replied,—

First, it is true that what Simon attempted to buy was a spiritual gift, but he valued this gift not for any spiritual grace that it bestowed, (this is clear from his character as described in Holy Scripture and Church[3] History,) but for the temporal advantage that would accrue from it to himself

[1] In a brief statement like the present it is not possible to treat this grave question adequately. Let me therefore invite the reader's attention to the following works:—Van Espen de Simoniâ circa Beneficia, Jus Eccles. Univ. pars ii. tit. xxx., and his separate treatise, De Simoniâ, ibid. tom. ii. p. 185, Colon. 1748. Bishop Gibson's Codex, p. 799. Bishop Stillingfleet, in his treatise on Bonds of Resignation, Lond. 1702. Thomassinus de Beneficiis, tom. vii. p. 443, and tom. x. p. 225. The treatise of Suarez de Simoniâ, in Migne's Theol. Cursus Completus, vol. xvi. p. 322. Dr. Phillimore's Judgment in the Dean of York's case in Burn's Eccl. Law, ed. Lond. 1842, iii. 607. The British Critic, Art. lx. Oct. 1841. Rev. W. D. Willis on Simony, 1865. Dr. A. Stephens' Eccl. Law. Sir R. Phillimore's Eccl. Law, p. 1110—1147, Lond. 1873.

[2] Acts viii. 18, 23.

[3] Which represents him as a sorcerer (whence his name Simon Magus) and also as an arch-heretic. See Tillemont, Mémoires, tom. ii. p. 16, ed. 1732.

—whether in secular profit, or worldly fame, or both. This is what is done by the purchasers of Church Preferment. They purchase spiritual things with a view to temporal ends.

Secondly, they allege that they buy the temporal benefice and not the sacred office. But this is not true. The benefice is annexed to the office, not the office to the benefice. The benefice exists on account of the office, and not the office on account of the benefice. The office is the principal thing, the benefice is an accessory to it. The administration of spiritual functions was not instituted for the sake of the temporal emolument, but the temporal emolument is granted for the administration of the spiritual functions.

Let us ask this question: Do they desire to proclaim themselves *hirelings*, and to incur the malediction of Him who said, "The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep"?[4] The hireling cares only for his hire; this is the essence of his character; and if he tells us that *his hire* is what *he buys*, then he has condemned himself as a *hireling*.

But further, it is evident, that what he buys is the *cure of souls*; for he cannot touch any part of the temporalities before he has been admitted to the cure of souls. He must first come to the Bishop for *Institution*. Institution is a solemn act, by which the Chief Pastor of a Diocese admits a Clergyman to a cure of souls in it:[5] Institution is the act of the Bishop, and is a prerequisite to Induction. Induction is performed by another person, the Archdeacon; and by it the clergyman, having first been instituted to the cure of souls, and to the ministry of the Word of God and of the Sacraments by the Bishop, is afterwards put into corporal possession of the *temporalities* of the benefice.

It is clear, therefore, that what is bought (I do not say

[4] John x. 13: see St. Augustine's commentary there (Tract xlvi.), in which the words of our Lord are applied to Simoniacal clergymen; also his Sermon on John x. 1—16, Serm. 137.

[5] The words of Institution are—"We do by these presents commit unto you the *cure and government of the souls* of the Parishioners, and authorize you to *preach the Word of God, and to administer the Holy Sacraments* in the Parish Church. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

the only thing that is bought) is the admission to the Cure of Souls and to the Ministry of the Sacraments; for, if that were not first procured, there would be no claim to the revenues of the benefice. Therefore the purchase of a benefice by a clergyman, or by any one acting on his behalf, is the purchase of spiritual things, which is Simony. This is the judgment of the Church Universal, and of the Church of England.

As to the Church Universal,—to omit other authorities,[6] —its mind was clearly pronounced by a decree of the fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

The decree begins with condemning Simoniacal collations of holy Orders, and then proceeds to speak of preferment to *benefices* in the Church, and says, that if any Bishop, for the sake of money, shall have promoted any treasurer, or advocate, or sacrist, or any ecclesiastical persons, with a view to sordid lucre, he shall be in danger of deposition; and no one who shall have been so ordained or promoted shall derive any benefit from the ordination or promotion which has been purchased, but *be removed from the dignity or cure which he has obtained by money.* And if any one can be proved to have negotiated as an agent in such base traffic, if he is a clergyman, let him be degraded, but if a layman, let him be anathematized.[7]

By the law of the Church, Simony is defined to be a deliberate act or a premeditated will and desire of selling or buying such things as "are spiritual, or of any thing *annexed unto spirituals,*" such as an ecclesiastical benefice; or of giving something of a temporal nature for the purchase thereof; or, in other words, it is a commutation of things spiritual, or annexed unto spirituals, for something that is temporal; or as Lancelot[8] briefly expresses it, "Simonia est studiosa voluntas, sive cupiditas, emendi vel vendendi spiritualia, vel *spiritualibus annexa.*"

[6] These have been collected by Launoy in his learned work on Simony. Launoii Opera, tom. ii. pt. ii. p. 451—563, ed. Colon. 1731. See also the works quoted above, p. 173, note.

[7] This is the second Canon of the General Council of Chalcedon; and may be seen in Labbe's Concilia, tom. iv. p. 756, ed. Paris, 1671.

[8] Lancelot, Instit. Juris Canon. lib. iv. t 3.

The Church of England is explicit in her declarations on this subject.

The opinions of our English Reformers may be seen in the Injunctions published by King Edward VI., in 1547, and Queen Elizabeth, in 1559,[9] where it is said that "to avoid the detestable sin *of Simony*, and because *the buying and selling of Benefices is execrable before God*, therefore *all such persons as buy any Benefices* shall be *deprived of such Benefices*, and be made unable at any time after to receive any other spiritual promotion." And among the Canons of 1603, Canon 40th was specially framed "for the avoidance of the detestable sin of Simony, and because the *buying of Ecclesiastical functions and livings is execrable before God.*"

In the Canons of 1571, framed under Archbishop Parker, and subscribed by the Bishops of both Provinces, is the following remarkable decree concerning Church Patronage and Simony,[1] "The Bishop shall earnestly exhort Patrons of benefices to consider the needs of the Church, and to have ever before their eyes the Last Day, and the Judgment and Tribunal of God; and, therefore, not to present any one to an ecclesiastical office, except such persons as by learning, discretion, piety, probity, and blamelessness of life are qualified to discharge so weighty a function; and that they do nothing in this matter, otherwise than with integrity, honesty, and sincerity. And let the Bishop warn them, that he will use all fair and lawful means to discover the truth therein. And if he should find, either at the time of presentation, or after it, that any corrupt proceeding or Simoniacal traffic has been resorted to, in any manner whatsoever, however clandestinely, either directly or indirectly, either by the Patron himself or by others, with a view to the procuring of any money or price, or any commodity, or any portion of the revenues, let him advertise the Patron that he is resolved to make a public proclamation of the fact, not only in his Cathedral Church, but also in other places, to the disgrace and eternal infamy of the Patron;

[9] See Bishop Gibson's Codex, p. 101.

[1] In Cardwell's Synodalia i. p. 129.

and that he is further *determined to remove the* Presbyter, *whom he has so nefariously presented,* not only from the benefice which he has dishonestly entered, but from all ministrations in the Diocese."

Such was the language of the Church of England at the Reformation, concerning Church Patronage and Simony.

Our greatest lawyers have used the same. Lord Chief Justice Coke says (I. Inst. 17, b) that "the Common Law doth detest Simony and all corrupt bargains for presentation to any benefice; and its design is, that a fit person for the discharge of the cure should be presented freely, without expectation of anything."

But I will not dwell on the temporal aspects of the question, which is dealt with in the Statutes of 31 Eliz. cap. 6, and 12 Anne, cap. 12, which not only forbid a Clergyman to purchase for himself a next presentation with his own money, but *to take and accept* a next presentation so bought.

If the purchase of a next presentation by a Clergyman is Simoniacal, it is difficult to see why the purchase of an *Advowson,* with the intent to use in his own behalf the *next presentation,* is not also Simoniacal; for what is an Advowson but a series of successive presentations? And if he may use the next presentation for himself, and then sell the Advowson to another Clergyman who may do the same thing in his turn, we have what the prophet calls a process of "drawing sin as with a cart-rope" (Isaiah v. 18).

Our principal concern here is with the declarations of Holy Scripture, and of the Church. They affirm that Simony is a sin in the sight of God, and that "it consists not only in trafficking for the gifts of the Holy Spirit (Acts viii. 18—20), but in purchases made by Clergymen of spiritual preferments (Bingham, Ant. xvi. 6)."

Our Church (in her 40th Canon of 1603, above quoted), defines Simony to "be the buying and selling of Spiritual and Ecclesiastical functions, offices, promotions, dignities, and livings," and declares it to be a "detestable sin," and "execrable before God." Simony is punishable by Ecclesiastical Laws; the Canon of 1571, just cited, seems plainly to assume this. And our most learned Canonists have

shown—namely, Archbishop Wake, Bishop Stillingfleet, and Bishop Gibson (see Codex ii. 798, 801)—that it was never the intention of the Civil Legislature "to repeal Ecclesiastical Laws concerning Simony, or to determine the nature and bounds of it." The Temporal Courts have generally held that "Simony is a thing of spiritual cognizance," and have granted consultations accordingly (Gibson, 798). In the case of Baker *v.* Rogers, the Court of Common Pleas declared that it appertains to the Spiritual Court to determine what is Simony (*Ibid.* 798), and Bishop Stillingfleet says (Ecclesiastical Cases, i. 59, cp. p. 316), "by the Canon Law it was deprivation for a Clergyman to be convicted of buying an Ecclesiastical Benefice for his own benefit."

Let me now offer some remarks by way of practical application.

The Law of Church Patronage cannot remain as it is. The question is—What is to be done for its amendment?

1. Let the attempt already made in Parliament by the present Home Secretary, Mr. Cross, with every prospect of success, be renewed. Let the sale of Next Presentations to Cures of Souls be prohibited by law, with penalties imposed on all persons who are concerned in them. Let also the sale of Advowsons for *private interests*,[2] after a certain date and with due compensation, be forbidden. This may seem a stringent measure; but it has already been enacted by the Legislature for Scotland. Advowsons are generally bought for the sake of the next Presentation. In many Advertisements of the Sale of Advowsons, the words, "*with immediate possession*," occur, intimating that the next Presentation is the thing specially offered and supposed to be desired. And it will be found also, that when the Advowson has been purchased, and when the next Presentation has been used by the Purchaser, then the Advowson

[2] I will not enter into the question, whether the sale of certain livings in the gift of the Lord Chancellor was justifiable. The Sale was for *the benefit of the Church*, and has been defended on the same principle as the casting of the wheat into the sea to save the ship and the crew (Acts xxvii. 38), and as the pulling down of an old church is justified when it is done for the sake of building a better one on the same, or a more commodious, site.

appears again in the market, and is sold to another Purchaser who treats it in the same manner. In fact Sales of Advowsons are often nothing else than Sales of a series of next Presentations. I am speaking especially of what are called "*Advowsons in gross*," and not of "*Advowsons appendant*" to Manors or Estates. And if the Sale of next Presentations were forbidden, but the Sale of Advowsons or of Life Interests in Advowsons were to continue to be allowed, then the Sale of next Presentations, involved in the Sale of Advowsons, would become more rife; and the prohibition of the Sale of next Presentations, properly so called, would be virtually null and void.

The only sound principle, as it seems to me, is that which is grounded on Holy Scripture, and on the doctrine and practice of the Christian Church in its best ages.

The Sale of Church preferment is contrary to fundamental doctrines of Christianity. There is no common measure between money and immortal souls which the Son of God Himself has purchased with His own most precious Blood. The Sale of a cure of souls violates that liberty with which Christ Himself has made them free (Gal. v. 1). It is a spiritual slave-trade.

These principles are embodied in the Decrees of the Christian Church, especially in the Second Canon of the Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, in A.D. 451, and in the universal consent of Christendom, which declared that Church Patronage is not a marketable commodity, for the private interest of Patrons, but a sacred trust for the glory of God, and for the good of His people.

The Christian Church, for a thousand years after Christ never imagined that Advowsons (*advocationes*) to the Cure of Souls could be bought and sold for money.

It appears from the learned researches of Van Espen quoted above, that Advowsons were transferred together with the Manor to which they appertained, but were not sold separately.

What is now to be done with "*Advowsons in gross*,"—that is, not attached to any Estate—is a question which deserves careful consideration. Vested Interests are to be

respected, and some process might be devised by which these Advowsons (if a Sale of them were requisite), might be taken out of their present anomalous predicament, and either be attached to Estates, or placed in the hands of some public Patron or Patrons, who would dispense their patronage with a view to the general good.

Such an act of Spiritual Emancipation would be worthy of a great Nation, which has done more than any other to abolish the Slave-Trade.

As to the Sale of *Life Interests in Advowsons*, What would be said of a Bishop, or other Ecclesiastical Patron, who bartered for private advantage his Life Interest in the Benefices of which he is Patron? But why should a Cure of Souls in Lay Patronage be worse off spiritually than a Parish in Episcopal hands? Why should the Sale of it in the former case be connived at as venial, and be denounced as Simoniacal in the other?

There are about 7000 Benefices in Lay Patronage in England and Wales; and if they were bestowed on meritorious Clergymen, the scandal of the present secular traffic in spiritual things would be removed, and a remedy would be provided for another glaring abuse, which is generally deplored, namely, that many faithful and zealous Clergymen are now allowed to remain Curates for twenty or thirty years, and perhaps during the whole of their lives.

2. Let Bishops be protected and supported in refusing to institute Clergymen, who, either directly or indirectly, are guilty of Simoniacal practices. Let Parishes also be protected in declining to receive[3] such Clergymen as their Pastors.

[3] To my own knowledge a living lately became vacant. It could not be sold during the vacancy. What was done? A decrepit clergyman was found, and he was presented to the living. And then the living was advertised, and sold with "prospect of immediate possession," and a large price was realized accordingly. The indignation of the Parishioners may be imagined.

The following case is too common. A clergyman is patron of a benefice which he holds; and wishes to sell the Advowson. He privately promises to present a clergyman who buys the Advowson, or for whom it is bought; and then he resigns the benefice, and presents him to it.

3. The best course for rich capitalists, who have sons in holy orders, is *not to buy "good livings"* for them, but to *augment* the *endowment* of *poor ones*, and to offer their sons to a Bishop for the pastoral cure of those Parishes. This would be a noble investment of their capital; and would yield a rich profit in a better world.

4. Let it be suggested also for consideration, whether *Bonds of resignation* of benefices should not be rendered illegal. After reading the learned treatise of Bishop Stillingfleet on this subject,[4] few persons can entertain a doubt that these bonds approach very near to Simony. They are now lawful under certain conditions by 9 Geo. 4, c. 94; but that which is lawful is not here expedient (1 Cor. vi. 12; x. 23); and the temptation to it ought to be removed.

5. The present Declaration taken at Institution, concerning Simony, ought to be amended, either by being restored to its original form as it stood in the 40th Canon, or by being directed against all purchase, either direct or indirect, of the benefice.

6. *Donatives*, for well known reasons, ought to be put on the same footing as other benefices.

But Laws without morals will have little effect. Let all who are concerned in this matter examine their own consciences, as in the sight of God, and let them inform and regulate their consciences by His Will and Word, and by the judgment of His Church, and act accordingly.

1. Church Patronage is a sacred Trust to be administered for the glory of God, and the good of His People; and He will demand a strict account of Patrons how it has been exercised. Can a Patron look with any reasonable hope to that Day of reckoning, if he has used it for his own temporal interest? On the other hand, there is not a more noble spectacle, in this money-getting and money-loving age, than

[4] Bishop Stillingfleet's Discourses concerning Bonds of Resignation of Benefices in point of Law and Conscience; in his Ecclesiastical Cases, vol. i. p. 175, Lond. 1702. The thirty-fifth Canon of the Church of Ireland (A.D. 1634), condemns Bonds of Resignation. The judgments of Lord Chancellor Thurlow and Lord Chancellor Eldon against them, may be seen in Burn, iii. 632, 636; Phillimore, pp. 1122, 1124.

that of a Patron resisting the temptations of worldly gain, and administering his patronage in a pure, unselfish, disinterested spirit of Christian patriotism and loyalty to God and man. The Patrons of Ecclesiastical Benefices hold a high place of honour, and are entitled to respect. They represent those who laid on God's altar the offering of tithes and other revenues to be dedicated for ever to His Glory, and to the salvation of souls. Their very name indicates a *trust*.

It is supposed by some that the word *Advowson* implies *property;* this is an error; it represents *duty*. The English word *Advowson* is from the Latin *Advocatio;* and it does not at all mean, as some think, that he who has it, has a right to *call* a clerk *to* the benefice (advocare ad beneficium); but it means that he has the responsible duty of *Advocation*, i.e. of being an *advocate* or *pleader* for the Parish. His duty, implied by the name, is to *defend* it against all harm.

And this is further illustrated by his name *Patron*. That name is from the Roman Law, in which a *patronus* was an *Advocate* or *pleader* in a lawsuit for a *client*.

And those persons who have *advowsons*, or *advocationes*, are *Patrons*—that is, advocates, defenders of the rights of God and His people[5] in the parishes where they are patrons. Those rights are their *clientela;* a more honourable retinue than ever escorted a Roman Patron in his progress through the crowded streets of the city, or flocked early in the morning to offer their salutations in his marble halls.[6] The privileges and responsibilities of Patrons, have been expressed metrically in the following legal aphorisms:—

Patronum faciunt dos, ædificatio, fundus;

and what follows?

Patrono debetur honos, onus, utilitasque.

The *onus* and *utilitas* are consequent on the *honos*, and therefore it is added—

Præsentet, præsit, defendat; alatur egenus.

It is difficult to imagine a more dignified office than that of the Christian Patron. He is the honoured son of a loving

[5] Patrons are expressly called *advocati* and *defensores* in the Canon Law, see Van Espen, Part ii. tit. xxv. cap. i.

[6] Virg. Georg. ii. 462.

mother, the Church of God. In ancient times the nobles and princes of Europe gloried in the privilege of protecting and adorning Christian Churches. The Patron was met at the door of the Church by the Clergy and Congregation as a public benefactor. And he regarded the gratitude of the faithful, who enjoyed the benefit of a watchful and zealous Pastor by his means, as his best reward on earth; he had the recompense of their prayers, and of their blessings upon him and upon his family; in those prayers and blessings he had a pledge and foretaste of the infinite and eternal reward which he would receive at the Great Day from the Good Shepherd, Who shed His life-blood on the cross for him and for them. What unspeakable pleasure did he feel on visiting the Church, and in taking part in its holy ministrations, and in the consciousness that they were due, in great measure, to himself, as an instrument in the hand of God! Here was his joy in life, here was his comfort in the hour of death.

God be thanked that this beautiful picture is still realized in many Churches and Parishes in this and other Dioceses.

But let us look on the other side.

The Roman Poet, in his description of the nether world, and on the penalties reserved for those who have lived guilty lives on earth, represents the Furies as inflicting the most painful torments on those who hated their brethren, or maltreated their parents, or devised *frauds on their clients;*

> "Hic quibus invisi fratres, dum vita manebat,
> Pulsatusve parens, et *fraus* innexa *clienti*."[7]

Are not these sins committed by him who injures his Christian brethren, or does wrong to his mother the Church, or practises deceit on the Parishioners, who are his clients, and of whom he is the Patron? What would have been said of the Roman Patron, who sold his clients for money? What must be said of the Patron of a Church, who barters the souls of a parish for worldly pelf? Can there be any true profit to him from such a bargain? It is to be feared that, unless he repents, the purchase-money may be a blight on his property, and eat as a canker into his estate, his family, and himself, in body and soul, in this world and another.

[7] Virg. Æn. vi. 637.

On such grounds as these the sale of Advowsons has been strictly forbidden by Laws of the Church. (See Van Espen, Pars ii. tit. xv. c. iv.)

2. But if we thus speak of Patrons acting in this manner, what must be said of their legal advisers?

Dr. Thomas Fuller[8] describes the character of a good Lawyer, and compares him to the loyal soldier, who will never fight against his Prince; and in like manner, he says, the genuine Christian Lawyer will never fight against Him Who is the Truth, and the King of Kings. The good lawyer will never fight against Christ.

It is therefore submitted very respectfully for the consideration of solicitors and pleaders, especially of ecclesiastical lawyers, canonists, and civilians, whether their profession would not be much more honourable in the opinion of all good men, and much more profitable to themselves with reference to another world, if, instead of applying their learning and talents to devise means whereby the Clergy may evade the laws of the land concerning Simony, and contravene the authority of Holy Scripture and the Church of God, they would endeavour to deter them from these sins, which, though not perhaps discoverable by human eyes, or punishable by human tribunals, will assuredly expose them and their abettors and accomplices to severe pains and penalties from Him, before Whom all clients and lawyers must appear, and from Whom nothing is hid, and by Whom all things will be judged?

Bishop Stillingfleet thus writes:[9]—It is much to be "wished that Lawyers would not encourage their clients in indirect methods of obtaining presentations. Here lies a great part of our present mischief. Clergymen who want benefices say, We are ignorant of the Law, but we go to those whose business it is to understand it, and they tell us that they have cases and precedents in their books, and therefore why are we blamed if we submit to them?"

Thank God there are many noble examples of Christian Lawyers among us—may their number be greatly increased

[8] Fuller's Holy State, p. 51.

[9] Bp. Stillingfleet, Eccl. Cases, i. 358.

—who have dissuaded and deterred the Clergy from dishonouring themselves and their profession by resorting to unworthy artifices for the sake of worldly gain. Their names will shine hereafter among those of our Mores and our Hales of former times, and of many in our own days, who have shed a holy lustre on the Bench and on the Bar.

3. Let me specify here another practical remedy.

To the honour of many *English Newspapers* be it recorded that their proprietors refuse to admit *Simoniacal Advertisements* into their columns. All honour to them for this sacrifice of worldly lucre for a sacred principle. They will have their recompense hereafter, and probably here; they will have it in the approval of a good conscience, and in the praise and encouragement of good men.

It is to be earnestly hoped, that the time is not far distant when the proprietors of the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, which, as I have said, is regarded by some as an accredited organ of the Church of England, will announce publicly their intention of excluding such Advertisements[1] from their pages, and will thus remove a scandal which is caused to many good men, and will take away the occasion of scoffing and exultation which is given thereby to the enemies of the Church of England, and will cease to promote and encourage a secular traffic in spiritual things, which is detrimental to her welfare, forbidden by her canons, and displeasing to her Divine Head.

Such a sacrifice on their part would cause great gratification to her members, and would not fail of its reward.

4. But the principal remedy of the evil lies with the Bishops and Clergy of the Church.

Of all the weights which press heavily on the conscience of a Bishop, one of the heaviest is that which is laid upon him by the present laws of the land with regard to Church Patronage and Simony. Sometimes cases arise where everything appears to be against him. Some Patrons are against him; because they present unworthy Clergymen to Benefices, who claim admission to the cure of souls in Livings, which

[1] See above, pp. 168, 169. I am very thankful to be able to add that this suggestion has now been anticipated by the present Editor and Proprietors of the *Ecclesiastical Gazette*, Jan., 1879.

they or their friends have bought by means which are morally Simoniacal, but which cannot perhaps be legally proved to be so. Some Lawyers and clerical agents are against him, because they give opinions, or devise expedients, and set traps, by which the Clergy are ensnared into what is Simoniacal in the eye of God and of the Church. Some Clergymen are against him, because they come to him with a deed of presentation in their hands, which has been purchased for them by a friend. Or they may even have bought it with their own money. They buy Advowsons, or life-interests, of Patrons, and claim the right of presenting themselves to the cure of souls which they have bought with their own money; and he is to bear the burden of resisting such a claim as that.[2]

It seems to be forgotten by some, that a Bishop is the responsible guardian of the souls in every Parish in his Diocese. A *Bishop* is the *Curate* (to use the word in its proper sense) of his *Diocese*. And "Institution" is the act by which he devolves the cure of souls in a Parish on the Clergyman whom he institutes to it. "Accipe curam tuam, *et meam*," is the ancient form of Institution,[3] and contains an appeal to God. Can a Bishop, therefore, in conscience, institute a Clergyman to a cure of souls which he has bought? Would he not, by so doing, be a "partaker of other men's sins"? (1 Tim. v. 22.)

And yet they, whom a Bishop admonishes in a spirit of love, and whom he would restrain from committing a heinous sin, and from forcing themselves into a cure thus bought, and whom he desires to save from the consequences of that sin,—in this world and in another,—do not regard him as a benefactor, but count him as an enemy, "because he speaks to them the truth" (Gal. iv. 16).

But although all these things are against him, he must commit his cause in faith and patience to God, and be content to suffer for the truth's sake. He must carefully consider

[2] The Lawsuit of *Walsh* v. *the Bishop of Lincoln* (the Great Coates Case), cost the defendant about 1000*l.*, which was generously defrayed by the Diocese.

[3] Gibson, p. 807. Burn, i. 167.

what is the Law of Holy Scripture and the Church, and he must act accordingly.[4]

5. Lastly, if the Clergy, whom it may concern, would take due care to enlighten their consciences as to the true character of Simony; if they would not carry their conscience to law-books, but to the Word of God, and to the judgment of the Church; if they would be on their guard against all secular allurements to obtain preferment by questionable means, and would not entangle themselves in snares, and so rob themselves of that peace of mind and approval of God, which every good man will value infinitely more than the best living in the world; and would unite in a deliberate resolve to take no part, either directly or indirectly, in any purchase of a benefice for themselves, or in procuring any benefice by means of any corrupt promise or engagement, and if they would determine to decline any benefice so purchased, or procured (and I rejoice to know that many of them are so minded), then the sin of Simony would soon disappear from among us.

We may apply here the solemn words of our Blessed Lord to His disciples, "I say unto you, that except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 20). The Clergy, the appointed Teachers of the pure and perfect morality of the Gospel, must not allow their consciences to be brought down to the low level of secular jurisprudence; they must live above the standard of temporal law-courts. Temporal laws, which are framed "for the lawless and disobedient" (1 Tim. i. 9), are unsafe

[4] The following circular letter, with regard to Clergymen acting as Patrons for their own benefit, was issued by the late Bishop of Exeter:—

"*Bishopstowe, Torquay, 28th March*, 1867.

DEAR MR. ARCHDEACON,

Questions having arisen respecting the operation of the Act 12 Anne, c. 12, I request you to make known through the Rural Deans that I have thought it right to decline to accept any nomination of a *Clerical Patron of himself to a Living*, unless the patronage has accrued to him by gift or succession. This resolution of mine has been taken as most conformed to the spirit of the Statute.

I am, dear Mr. Archdeacon, Your faithful friend and brother,

H. EXETER."

guides and guardians for those whose work it is to save souls. The shrewd acuteness of the Jurisconsult (very necessary and laudable in its own province) is a very different thing from the tender sensitiveness and the disinterested self-sacrifice of the Christian Priest. An act may be Simoniacal in the eye of God and His Church, though no human tribunal may punish it. He must look upward to the dictates of that higher Law "whose seat is in the bosom of God; and whose voice is the harmony of the world" (Hooker, i. xviii. 7).

The Clergy are entitled by the Law of God to a liberal maintenance. The labourer is worthy of his hire (Luke x. 7). But he who labours for hire is a hireling, and is condemned by Christ as such (John x. 12, 13). The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel (1 Cor. ix. 13. Gal. vi. 7). But woe unto those who preach the Gospel in order to live by it; and not in order that they to whom they preach may live for ever by their ministry. In Scripture the examples of selfishness in Ministers of holy things are exposed to eternal infamy in Balaam, who loved the wages of unrighteousness, and prophesied for reward (2 Pet. ii. 15), and in Hophni and Phinehas, who made men abhor the offering of the Lord, by thinking of what they could draw up for themselves by their own flesh-hook (1 Sam. ii. 12, 14), and whose sin is therefore said to have been very great; and in Gehazi, who was punished with leprosy for not fearing to bring contempt on his master Elisha, and on Elisha's God, by his covetousness (2 Kings v. 22, 26, 27), and in those of whom Micah speaks: "The priests teach for hire, and the prophets divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? None evil can come upon us" (Micah iii. 11); and in those teachers, of whom St. Peter speaks, "by reason of whom the word of truth is evil spoken of, who through covetousness with feigned words make merchandise of men's souls; and whose damnation now of a long time slumbereth not" (2 Pet. ii. 3), and in the traitor, Judas the Apostle, who sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver.

The Church of England, adopting the words of Holy Scripture, reminds her Priests at their Ordination, that "the Church and Congregation which they must serve, is no other than the Spouse and Body of Christ; that they are His sheep, which He bought with His death, and for whom He shed His Blood upon the Cross." Shall any man dare to sell or buy the Spouse of Christ with money? Shall any man venture to sell or buy the Body of Christ? By so doing, he adds the sin of Judas to that of Simon Magus. The Christian Fathers do not hesitate to call all such persons "sellers of Christ;"[5] secular traffickers in spiritual things, who imagine that "godliness is a trade" (1 Tim. vi. 5). Shall any man treat Christian congregations—the sheep and lambs of Christ, which He has purchased with His own blood—as if they were like the beasts that perish, to be carried from pens in market-places to slaughter-houses in shambles?

This is what is done by those Christian Priests who, like the shepherds denounced by Ezekiel, undertake the pastoral office in order to eat the fat, and clothe themselves with the wool (Ezek. xxxiv. 2—4), and to whom he says in the name of God, "Behold I am against the shepherds, and I will require My flock at their hands" (ver. 7).

But let us hope and pray that such shepherds as those, if they have been like Gehazi in sin, may be like him in repentance (see 2 Kings viii. 4); and that the number may greatly increase of those who can say with the Apostle to their people, "I seek not yours, but you" (2 Cor. xii. 14), "I have coveted no man's silver or gold—for it is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts xx. 33—35), "neither at any time used we a cloke of covetousness, God is witness" (1 Thess. ii. 5). And whatever may be their temporal condition in this life, may they obey the precept of that blessed Apostle, who out of weakness became strong, and who rejoiced to follow his Master to the Cross, and who, having heard those words which prescribed the test by which his love to Christ was to be proved, "Feed My

[5] See Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. i. 3; and the passages in Bentley's Sermon on the Fifth November, near the beginning.

lambs; feed My sheep" (John xxi. 15—17), left this solemn charge to the clergy, "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; feed the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock; and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away" (1 Pet. v. 1—4).

PRAYER.

O LORD JESU CHRIST, Who didst twice drive the buyers and sellers from the courts of Thy Father's House, we pray Thee to cleanse and defend Thy Church from all secular traffic in spiritual things; and grant that being alway preserved from false apostles, it may be ordered and guided by faithful and true Pastors, to Thy honour and glory, Who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost, One God, world without end. AMEN.

CLERICAL NON-RESIDENCE:

An earnest Appeal from the Bishop of Lincoln to Clergymen of the Diocese who are not resident in their Parishes, or who may intend to apply for leave of Non-residence.

My Reverend Brethren,

The generous spirit of sympathy and confidence shown towards the Clergy by many of the principal Laymen of this County at the meeting held yesterday (Aug. 6, 1870), at Lincoln, for the "*Augmentation of Poor Benefices,*" calls for our grateful acknowledgments, and may well stimulate us to examine what are the defects in our own practice which need reformation.

It can hardly be doubted that one of the greatest of these is *Clerical Non-residence.*

In late years this evil has been greatly abated, but (as appears from official returns) it requires further amendment; and one of the many advantages to be anticipated from the design for the improvement of Poor Benefices is, that it will conduce to a further diminution of the evil.

The question, however, that now presses upon us is this, whether we ourselves may not do much to correct it? I would therefore invite you to consider what our duty is in this respect; and, in doing so, I feel persuaded that you will receive in good part that which is now offered for your consideration, from an earnest desire for our common welfare in time and eternity, and for the honour of our Divine Master and Judge, and for the spiritual benefit of His people committed to our charge.

As Christ's ministers, we are bound to regard this question in the light in which it is presented to us by Almighty God in Holy Scripture.

Our blessed Lord applied a test to St. Peter, and He applies that test to all His ministers: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?"[1] The answer was, "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee;" and the proof which our Saviour demanded of that love was prescribed in the commands, "Feed My lambs," "Feed My sheep," "*Tend*[2] My sheep,"—those lambs and sheep for which the Good Shepherd laid down His life.

If the Christian Pastor is not resident among his flock, he cannot comply with these commands of Christ; and if his non-residence is not absolutely necessary, he cannot in truth be said to love Christ; and we know where it is written, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha."[3]

Our Blessed Lord has also specified, as a characteristic of the faithful shepherd, that "He calleth his *own sheep by name*, and leadeth them out," and "they *know his voice*;"[4] and our Lord marks it as a token of the hireling shepherd, that "he *leaveth the sheep*, and fleeth, because he careth not for the sheep;"[5] and the Holy Spirit, as if He had anticipated Christ's words, has said by the prophet, "Woe to the idol shepherd that *leaveth the flock!*"[6]

With such denunciations as these ringing in his ears, a Pastor who forsakes his flock, and quits his parish, from motives of convenience, or because he does not like the neighbourhood, or because he thinks himself isolated there, or because some other place is more agreeable to his taste, and who, by his own absence, renders the neighbourhood more lonely, and tempts others to leave it, till it may become a spiritual wilderness, can surely have little comfort in his

[1] John xxi. 15.

[2] The use of *two* words (in the original), "Feed" and "Tend," brings out more clearly the duty of personal oversight on the part of the Christian pastor.

[3] I. e. "The Lord will come (to judge)."—1 Cor. xvi. 22.

[4] John x. 3, 4. [5] John x. 12, 13. [6] Zech. xi. 17.

conscience, if he reflects seriously on the matter in the presence of Almighty God, and in forethought of his own future account at the Great Day of reckoning; and if it should happen, that while absenting himself from the parish committed to his care, such a Pastor should be visited by severe sickness, or be suddenly overtaken by some other calamity, will he not hear a voice rehearsing the question which the Judge will put to him at that future Day: "Where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock?" [7]

The only wise and loving counsel that can be given to such a Pastor is this: Either return at once to thy parish, and *reside* there,—or else *resign it.*

The popular expression, a "*non-resident incumbent,*" shows how deeply the evil of non-residence is seated. An *incumbent* is a person "*qui incumbit operi,*" one who bends himself with all his might and main over his work, and who spends himself, and is spent, in it and for it; but a non-resident Pastor is *not* an *incumbent* at all. He has the charge of "God's husbandry," [8] but he has "put his hand to the plough, and has looked back," [9]—we know what follows; he has done even worse than this, he has left his plough in the furrow, and has forsaken the field.

An *Incumbent* of a parish is a person, who, when he was ordained to the Christian ministry, made a solemn promise in the presence of God and the public congregation, that "he would teach the people committed to his charge;" [1] that "he would use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole within his cure," and "would make himself and his household to be a wholesome example and pattern to the flock of Christ."

Not one of these things can be done by a Pastor who is not resident among his people. And at his Ordination he was also solemnly warned in these words: "If it shall happen that the same Church, or any member thereof, take any hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence, you know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue." [2]

[7] Jer. xiii. 20.
[8] 1 Cor. iii. 9.
[9] Luke ix. 62.
[1] Ordination of Priests.
[2] Ordination of Priests.

These statements are grounded on the declarations of Holy Scripture: "O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his *blood will I require at thine hand.*"[3] And St. Paul implies, that he himself could not have been *clear from the blood* of his flock, if he had not declared to them "the whole counsel of God."[4]

A benefice is assigned to a man for work. "*Beneficium* est propter *officium.*" And if the work that can be done is not done, the claim to the benefice is virtually cancelled, and a punishment for the neglect is incurred.

To those Clergymen who derive an income from a Parish in which, without absolute necessity, they do not personally reside, let me earnestly commend for their consideration the following solemn words of Almighty God, speaking by the prophet Ezekiel. They may there see a description of themselves:[5]—"Woe be to the Shepherds, that do feed themselves. Should not the Shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool; but ye do not feed the flock; therefore ye Shepherds, hear the Word of the Lord, thus saith the Lord God, Behold I am against the Shepherds, and I will require My flock at their hand."

"I seek not yours, but you,"[6] said St. Paul to the Corinthians; but the Pastor who forsakes his parish, and yet claims an income from it, reverses these words of the Apostle; and, "I seek not you, but yours," is the language of *his* practice.

In that affecting farewell charge which St. Paul delivered at Miletus to the Clergy of Ephesus, when he had sent for them to hear his apostolic injunctions, he said, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood;"[7] and thus he declared the solemn truth, that a Pastor's neglect of the flock committed to his care involves a sin against the

[3] Ezek. xxxiii. 7, 8.
[4] Acts xx. 27.
[5] Ezek. xxxiv. 1—10.
[6] 2 Cor. xii. 14.
[7] Acts xx. 28.

Holy Ghost, and a sin against Christ, Whose flock it is, and Who shed His blood for it. St. Paul said to Timothy, whom he left at Ephesus, when he went into Macedonia, "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; meditate upon these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear unto all."[8] "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall judge the quick and dead at His appearing and His Kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine."[9]

The non-resident Pastor does not comply with these Apostolic injunctions; and when he comes near the end of his mortal career, he will be in no condition to apply to himself that comfortable assurance which the holy Apostle, on the eve of his own departure, derived from the thought of his approaching dissolution, and from a retrospect of his own ministerial work: "I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day."[1]

It is only the faithful, vigilant, and zealous Pastor who can cherish that hope; it is only he, who can look for that blessed reward of which St. Paul's brother Apostle[2] speaks to the presbyters of the Church of Christ, "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

In his work on the "Pastoral Care"[3]—an excellent Manual for the Clergy—Bishop Burnet observes, that St. Paul in reckoning up the several obligations of Christians says, "Having gifts differing according to the grace that is given us, whether prophecy (i. e. preaching), let us prophesy (or

[8] 1 Tim. iv. 13—15.
[1] 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.
[9] 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2.
[2] 1 Pet. v. 2, 4.
[3] 4th Edit. Lond. 1736, p. 32. I have inserted a few words at the beginning of this quotation, and have varied one or two of the expressions in it.

preach) according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that ruleth, let him do it with diligence."[4] In his Epistle to the Corinthians, as he states the dignity of the Clergy in this, that they ought to be accounted as "the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God," he adds, that "it is required in stewards, that a man be *found faithful*."[5]

"In that Epistle he sets down that perpetual law, which is the foundation of all the provisions that have been made for the Clergy, 'that the Lord hath ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.'[6] But if upon this ground, the Laity have looked upon themselves as bound to appoint a supply, that the Clergy might have whereon to live, then certainly it was intended that they (the Clergy) might therefore attend 'continually on the ministry of the Word and Prayer.'[7] They of the Clergy who do their work negligently, provoke the Laity to repent of their bounty, and to deprive them of it; certainly, there are no such enemies to the patrimony and rights of the Church as those Pastors who eat the fat, but do not feed the flock."

And again, he says, "I think it as plain as words can make anything, that such persons as are dedicated to the service of God and of His Church, ought to labour constantly and faithfully, and *that in their own persons;* it is not possible to express a personal obligation in terms more strict and solemn, than those which are employed in Holy Scripture for that purpose; and all the returns of obedience and submission, of esteem and support, being declared to be due to the Clergy on account of their watching over and feeding the flock of God, those among them who pretend to these, without considering themselves as under the other obligations, are guilty of the worst kind of *sacrilege*, in devouring the things that are *sacred*, without doing those duties for which these are due; and what right soever the Law of the land may give them, yet certainly, according to the Divine Law, those who do not wait at the altar ought not to be par-

[4] Rom. xii. 6–8.
[5] 1 Cor. iv. 2.
[6] 1 Cor. ix. 14.
[7] Acts vi. 4.

takers with the altar; those who do not minister about holy things, ought not to live of the things of the temple; nor ought those who do not preach the gospel, to live of the gospel." [8]

I need hardly say, that what has now been written is not addressed to those who by some irresistible necessity are compelled, much against their will, to appeal to the Bishop for leave of non-residence. But then, in frankness and affection it must be added, that such cases are very few; and I would earnestly implore all who have any intentions of applying for such permission, to consider carefully what has been now said, and to examine their own consciences in the presence of God, whether they are justified in asking for it.

Bodily incapacity, which disables a man from doing the public duty of the Church in the Lord's house, is *not* an adequate reason for such a request. A Clergyman who has *not physical strength to preach a sermon* from the pulpit, *or to utter a prayer in the church,* may yet be an *inestimable blessing to his parish.* The example of his patient suffering is a daily sermon to his people. The prayers said in his family, and breathed from his sick-bed, bring down benedictions upon it. His ministerial experience, his fatherly management and counsel, are of unspeakable benefit to the Curate. The Parsonage is still the centre of the Christian charities of the parish. Blessings flow from it to every cottage, and although the Pastor himself may be disabled, yet there may be some wise and affectionate members of his family—a dear wife or children—dwelling under his roof who may be like sisters of mercy, or even like ministering angels, going forth from the threshold of the Parsonage on errands and embassies of love to the poor. The parish school feels the benefit of their fostering care. The parish choir is trained by them, or is helped by their presence and encouragement. The Parish would lose all these things, if the Pastor were non-resident. And how many benefits does the family of the Pastor *receive* by diffusing such benefits to the parish! Their affections are exercised; they become objects of love and gratitude to all around; their life on

[8] Burnet's "Pastoral Care," p. 44.

earth is a holy and happy life, and it is the best preparation for heaven.

This beautiful picture is not always realized; but even where it is not, yet it would be a great fallacy to suppose that, because a clergyman is unable to do his duty publicly in the parish church, he is therefore justified in asking for leave of non-residence. He may "do his duty" in many other ways in his parish; and as long as this is the case, he ought to be resident there, or else to resign his cure, and to make room for some one else, who will reside and take charge of it.[9]

We may now pass on to consider what is required in regard to residence, by the Law of the land.[1] "A beneficed clergyman, who does not reside personally on his benefice *nine months* of the year, without leave of non-residence from the Bishop of the diocese, or other exemption recognized by law, forfeits one-third part of the annual value of his benefice, if such absence exceeds three months; and if such absence exceeds six months, he forfeits one-half of the value; and if it exceeds eight months, he forfeits two-thirds of the value; and if such absence is continued for the whole year, he forfeits three-fourths of the value." [2]

These forfeitures are to be sued for in the Bishop's Court; and it is the duty of the Churchwardens, at Visitations, to

[9] A learned prelate who once filled the see of Lincoln, Bishop Gibson, justly observes, in his "Directions to his Clergy (1724)," that there are many important duties performed and benefits conferred by means of residence, altogether irrespective of the performance of the public offices of the Church. "Such," he says, "are a daily oversight, and a constant check and restraint upon evil practices, and upon the growth of corrupt customs and habits among the people; and that which exhorts and reproves most effectually of all, *the daily sight and influence of a good example;* to which we must add the being at hand to observe and compose differences; to assist the rich with counsel, the sick with comfort, the poor and distressed with relief, and to perform all neighbourly and charitable offices, which are the means of endearing ministers to their people, and of opening a passage into their hearts for spiritual instructions."

[1] The principal legislative enactments bearing on this subject are 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, and 13 & 14 Vict. c. 98.

[2] See 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, s. 32.

make presentments of the non-residence of the Minister of their parish; and the Bishop may direct that the forfeitures incurred by him for non-residence may be applied to augment the benefice, or to improve the parsonage.[3]

In all cases of non-residence without leave, it is the duty of the Bishop to require residence, by monition; and if the reasons alleged for non-residence are not satisfactory, to proceed, after a second requisition, to the sequestration of the benefice; and this sequestration involves a forfeiture of part of the profits of the benefice; and if the sequestration continues for a year, the benefice becomes void, and then "the Patron of such benefice may present or nominate to the same, as if the incumbent were dead."[4]

As to the *reasons* for non-residence, it seems to be supposed by some that a Bishop is at liberty to grant leave of non-residence for any cause, at his discretion. A clergyman lately applied to me for leave of non-residence, in order that he might attend on a sick mother in a distant part of the country. The sickness of a parent may be a reason for resigning a benefice, but it is not a sufficient reason for leaving the souls of a flock to suffer from spiritual sickness, and perhaps to incur spiritual death.

The Law is precise in specifying and defining the causes for which a bishop *may* (in no case *must*) grant a licence of non-residence.

They are these:—

1. Where a clergyman is "*prevented* from *residence* by any incapacity of mind or body." Incapacity for *doing duty* is not specified as a reason, but incapacity for *residing* in the parish, which is a different thing. If the incapacity is not such as to *prevent* him from *residence*, the licence ought not to be asked for.

2. He may have licence "for a period *not exceeding six months*, on account of the dangerous illness of his *wife or child making part of his family*;" but "*no* such licence is to be *renewed*, save with the allowance of the Archbishop of the province."

3. Where there is no house of residence, or where the

[3] 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, s. 114.

[4] Ibid. ss. 54, 56, 58.

house is unfit for residence. But in such cases he must reside in some other house within three miles of the parish church, unless it be certified to the satisfaction of the Bishop by the rural dean and two neighbouring incumbents, that no convenient house for residence can be obtained within the parish, or within three miles of the parish church. And in all cases the house of residence, wherever it is, is to be kept in good and sufficient repair at the cost of the incumbent.

No licence of non-residence continues in force after the 31st of December in the year next after the year in which the licence is granted.

No licence of non-residence can be granted (or, if granted, is of any validity) unless it be obtained by a *petition* presented by the clergyman, and drawn up in a certain form prescribed by law, and containing a statement of the following particulars:—

1. Whether the clergyman intends to perform the duties of the benefice in person; and if so, at what distance from the church he purposes to reside.

2. If he intends to employ a curate, what salary he purposes to give.

3. Whether such curate will reside in the parish; whether in the parsonage, or in what other house; and if not, at what distance from the parish church.

4. Whether such curate serves any other parish, or officiates in any other church or chapel.

5. The annual value and population of the benefice of the clergyman applying for leave of non-residence are also to be stated; and the number of churches or chapels in such benefice; and the date of the petitioner's admission to the benefice.

It is declared that it "*shall not be lawful for the Bishop* to grant any such licence," *except* after such *petition*, and "*unless* such petition shall contain a statement of the several particulars aforesaid."[5]

"Every such petition shall be filed in the registry of the diocese by the registrar thereof, and shall be open to inspec-

[5] 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, s. 42.

tion, and copies thereof may be made with the leave of the Bishop."

By the stringency of such penalties as these, the Law has clearly shown in what light it regards Non-residence.

Let me also remind you here that by a recent Statute, "The Incumbents' Resignation Act," 34 & 35 Vict. chap. 45, it is provided, that a Clergyman who is permanently incapacitated by infirmity may resign his benefice, and receive a pension equal to one-third of the net annual value of the benefice.

It is to be hoped that many Incumbents, in such circumstances, will take advantage of this enactment: and you will, I trust, bear with me when I say that this legislative measure lays a new obligation on the Diocesan to place before *non-resident* Incumbents, with additional force, the alternative *either* to *resign* their benefice, or to *reside* upon it.

But it is our privilege, my reverend brethren, to live in a higher atmosphere, and to do service, "not for wrath, but for conscience sake,"[6] and I would cherish the hope, that it may never be necessary to resort to the penalties of the law, which is "not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners;"[7] and that the love of Christ, Who shed His blood for His sheep, and for us their shepherds, will constrain us, and draw us irresistibly with the "cords of a man;"[8] and that we shall rejoice in His service, which is perfect freedom, and shall do our work, not with servile fear, but with filial love, and angelic alacrity, ever remembering that "He that winneth souls is wise,"[9] and that "They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever."[1]

I am, my reverend brethren, your faithful friend and brother,

C. LINCOLN.

[6] Rom. xiii. 5. [7] 1 Tim. i. 9. [8] Hos. xi. 4.
[9] Prov. xi. 30. [1] Dan. xii. 3.

ON MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

In 1854—1857, the question of constituting a "Divorce Court" was debated in Parliament. It was my endeavour, in the discharge of my duty as Canon of Westminster (a position which I had the honour of holding for nearly twenty-five years—from 1844 to 1869), to call the attention of the public to the character and tendencies of that measure, commonly called the *Divorce Bill*, in Discourses delivered on the subject in Westminster Abbey (in 1857), which were published in my "Occasional Sermons"—now out of print.

Portions of them will be reproduced here.

The apprehensions expressed in those Discourses have been realized. Divorce, before that time, was scarcely mentioned in Christian Society among us, without a feeling of shame and a shudder. But the newspaper reports of the proceedings in the Divorce Court—then constituted by Law—have now made it familiar. And the examples of conjugal infidelity in fashionable life and in high rank—displayed to public view with all their loathsome details, have destroyed much of that salutary abhorrence with which men recoiled from such things, as too revolting to be named. They have also had the effect of weakening the respect of the lower and middle ranks of society for the upper classes, and are doing the work of Socialism.

It is too much to expect that the Divorce Act will be repealed, for some time to come. But it is possible to create a more wholesome public opinion on the subject, and so either to prepare the way for repeal, or at least to diminish greatly the number of cases in which it is applied. This is a work for the Clergy and Laity of the Church; and perhaps the considerations urged in the following pages

may, with the Divine Blessing, be of some use in that respect.

One or two words more by way of preface.

When the Divorce Bill was before Parliament, my conviction was (see p. 222)—and that conviction has since been strengthened, that the cause of the advocates of the Divorce Bill was promoted by some of its leading opponents, who contended for the absolute indissolubility of marriage, in opposition to our Lord's words in two places of St. Matthew. This was an unscriptural and anti-scriptural position (see pp. 207—211), and therefore untenable; and the misfortune also was, that it identified those who held it with the Church of Rome, which with rigid strictness affirms Marriage to be indissoluble, and yet, with inconsistent and venal laxity, readily grants dispensations for Divorce (see pp. 212, 229). Some profitable instruction, as will be seen in the following pages, may be derived from these facts.

Let me mention also here, that being resident in London at the time, I was requested to act as Secretary by a body of Clergymen, which set on foot a "Declaration" against the Bill, and circulated it in every Parish in England and Wales. Many thousands of signatures were appended to that Declaration, which was presented to the Prime Minister. Unhappily he had announced his resolve to carry the Bill through Parliament; but he made one concession in consequence of the Declaration, viz. that no Clergyman should be required by law to solemnize the marriage of any person who had been found guilty in the Divorce Court.

PART I.

ON DIVORCE.

The Marriage Union is the source of household charities. If this fountain is preserved pure, the streams will be healthful; but if it be sullied, it will pour forth waters of sin and sorrow, diffusing a baleful influence in Families and

Nations. Marriage is a Divine Institution. Holy Scripture teaches us that the First Man was made in the Divine Image, and that Woman was created by God out of Man. One Man, and one Woman, formed by God out of Man, composed the human family. And man, being taught of God, said of woman, "This is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh."[1] And so near and dear was the intimacy thus cemented between the man and his wife, that it is declared in Holy Scripture to surpass even the filial relation; "For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh."[2] Thus Marriage is an Institution coeval with the Creation; and the covenant made by God cannot be unmade by man; "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[3]

Marriage was beautified and sanctified at the beginning; and fresh honours awaited it at the second Creation, when Christ, Who had "made the world,"[4] came down from heaven to "make all things new."[5] The eternal Word of God espoused our human Nature, and joined it to the Nature of God. Being born of a woman, He raised womanhood from its low estate. He, the Second Adam, formed to Himself a Church, the spiritual Eve, the mother of all living,[6] from His wounded side as He slept in death on the Cross; and He represents the dearness of that union between Himself and the Church under the figure of Marriage. Christ is the Bridegroom;[7] the Church is the Bride.[8] "He gave Himself for her, and loveth and cherisheth her as His own flesh."[9] And when she has been purified from the taint of this careworn world,[1] she will be presented to Him "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but prepared as a Bride adorned for her husband,[2] in pure raiment, clean and white;" and

[1] Gen. ii. 23.
[2] Gen. ii. 24. Matt. xix. 5.
[3] Matt. xix. 6.
[4] John i. 3. Heb. i. 2.
[5] Rev. xxi. 5.
[6] Gen. iii. 20.
[7] Matt. ix. 15. John iii. 29.
[8] Rev. xxi. 2.
[9] Eph. v. 25.
[1] Eph. v. 27.
[2] Rev. xxi. 2.

her espousals will be celebrated by Angels, and she will be for ever with the Lord.

Thus Christ by His Incarnation hallowed Wedlock; and therefore the Apostle proclaims it to be a "great Mystery."[3] Whatever therefore impairs the strength, or mars the beauty of the Marriage Covenant, is an offence against God, and against our compassionate Redeemer, and may expect to be visited with chastisements from Him, Who is King of Kings and Judge of all.

In the last twenty years great changes have taken place among us with regard to the Marriage Contract.[4] A marriage may now be performed as a secular bargain, without any benediction from Him who instituted it. We have sought for and obtained facilities for Marriage; and we now seek facilities for Divorce. The conjugal knot can be tied so easily, that we call for easy modes of untying it. Perhaps our desecration of Marriage may be punished by frequency of Divorce.

Hitherto, no Judicial Tribunal has been empowered in England to dissolve the bond of Matrimony. Such Divorces as take place among us are effected by special Acts of the Legislature, and are consequently rare, and are penal privileges of the rich.[5] The poor are exempt from them. We do not now inquire whether this is a right state of things. But such has been our condition for about a century and a half.[6]

But an important change is meditated.

It is proposed that a Judicial Tribunal (to be called a *Court of Divorce*) should now be constituted, with power to

[3] Eph. v. 32.

[4] Especially by 6 & 7 Will. IV. c. 85.

[5] Between the Reformation and the end of the 17th century, i.e. for a period of 150 years, the whole number of Divorce Bills was not more than three or four. In the eighteenth century they increased to 130; and the average of Divorce Bills in the last ten years has been about four a year.

[6] On this subject, in reference to England, see Reform. Legum, De Adulteriis et Divortiis, pp. 49—58; Canons of 1597 (Cardwell, p. 154), Canons of 1604, cv. cvi. cvii.; Parl. Hist. vol. xxxv. pp. 226–326, and the Report of the Commission on the Law of Divorce, 1853, with Lord Redesdale's Protest, and Phillimore, Eccl. Law, pp. 827—830.

dissolve the Marriage Contract; and that either of the parties who may be divorced by sentence of that Tribunal, should be allowed to marry again.[7]

Christ says in His Gospel, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, committeth adultery," and "Whosoever marrieth her that is put away committeth adultery."

But yet, we have now to deplore, that a legislative measure has at this time advanced far towards its consummation, which would enable a woman divorced for conjugal infidelity, to contract a new marriage, and which would even require the Church of Christ to invoke His benediction on those unhallowed Marriages, which He in His Holy Word has condemned as adulterous.

Christ is now sitting enthroned in majesty and glory at God's right Hand, as King of kings; He is now looking down on this Nation. He is trying the allegiance of the People of England, and of her Rulers, temporal and spiritual: He is testing the obedience of His Ministers; He is watching us one and all. And according to our acts in this present emergency will be our reward for weal or woe.

Here, then, is a subject of solemn importance to us all. The happiness of Families, the security of States, depend on the integrity of the Marriage Covenant. The eternal welfare of immortal souls is at stake.

We may now be about to enter on a new career of social existence. It is, therefore, incumbent on us to inquire,—What is the doctrine of the Gospel concerning Marriage and Divorce?

Especially is it the duty of the Clergy,—the Watchmen of the house of Israel,—to declare the counsel of God in this

[7] Amongst the provisions of the Bill referred to is the following:—

Liberty to Parties to marry again. § 38. "When the time hereby limited for appealing against any decree *dissolving a marriage* shall have expired, and no appeal shall have been presented against such decree, or if in the result of any appeal such marriage shall be declared to be dissolved, it shall be *lawful for the parties thereto to marry again, as if the prior marriage had been dissolved by the death of the other party thereto.*"

matter, and they will not be pure from the blood of the souls of those committed to their charge, if they shrink from this duty.

Let us, then, consult the oracles of God, and hearken to the voice of Him Who instituted Matrimony, and has invested it with divine beauty, and made it the nearest of human relations, and has transfigured it into an image of love and felicity and glory, transcending any that was ever seen even in Paradise,—by consecrating it into a picture of His own espousals in Heaven. Let us resort to Christ for instruction concerning Marriage;—let us sit at His feet,—and listen to His words.

We read in St. Matthew's Gospel that "The Pharisees came to Him, tempting Him, and saying unto Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"[8]

They came tempting Him: they had probably heard that He had declared to His disciples in the Sermon on the Mount,[9] "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorcement: but, I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery."

Doubtless this doctrine had a strange sound in the ears of the Pharisees. Their practice was to put away their wives for trivial causes; and they imagined that such a custom could be justified by the law of Moses, in the twenty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy. They wished to persuade the people that the doctrine of Jesus was contrary to the Law of Moses, which was Divine; and that therefore Jesus could not be a Prophet sent from God. And they imagined that they had now a fair opportunity of doing so. They resorted to an artifice like that employed by them on another occasion when they brought to our Lord a Woman taken in Adultery.[1] *Moses*, in the law, they then said, commanded that such should be stoned; but what sayest *Thou?* This they said, tempting Him. On that occasion they thought that they could show that our Lord contravened the Law of Moses by laxity, and now they would prove that He contradicted it by

[8] Matt. xix. 3. [9] Matt. v. 31. [1] John viii. 3.

severity. Our Lord, therefore, refers them to Moses himself. He sends them to the first Book of Moses. Are ye so little versed in the writings of Moses, have ye not read (He says), what he records in the first page of those writings, concerning the institution of Marriage? "God made them male and female," and said by Adam's voice teaching all his children, "that for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh. . . What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." [2]

"Why then," replied the Pharisees, "did Moses command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" [3]

The reply of our Lord was: Moses did *not command* any one to put away his wife. No; Moses taught you, in the Book of Genesis, what Marriage is. He showed you that God made in the beginning but *one man* and *one woman*; and that, in order to declare their intimate union, God made Woman out of Man; and that Adam signified that origin even by her name [4] . . . . "She shall be called *Woman*, because she was taken out of *man*." [5] Have ye not read these things? Did not God Himself write them by the hand of Moses? . . . But because, when He spake, ye would not hearken, therefore He punished you for the hardness of your hearts. He did not resist your obstinate and rebellious waywardness; He *suffered* you to put away your wives. He chose your delusions, and corrected you by your own

[2] Ab exordio conditionis humanæ (says St. Jerome, adv. Jovinian.) *non dabatur repudium.*

[3] It will be seen on examination of the original words in Deut. xxiv. 1, that the command is hypothetical, i. e. *if* they put away their wives, they must use a particular form, not *oral*, but, *in writing;* which supplied time for deliberation, and being written by a certain class, under certain conditions, gave occasion for dehortation by wise and grave persons. See S. Aug. c. Faust. xix. 26, who well says, "Non ait Dominus 'Qui voluerit, dimittat uxorem suam;' sed utique *nolebat* dimitti uxorem a viro, Qui hanc interposuit moram, ut in discidium animus præceps *libelli conscriptione* refractus absisteret, et quid mali esset uxorem dimittere cogitaret;" and because these libelli could only be written by advisers learned in the law. See also Buxtorfii Synagog. Jud. c. xl.

[4] Gen. ii. 23.

[5] *Ishah*, Hebr. Woman, from *Ish*, Hebr. Man. So *Virgo* from *Vir*.

wickedness,[6] that ye might see that wherein a man sinneth, therein he is also punished.[7] He did this in the same way as God gave Balaam leave to go, and punished him by means of his journey; and as He gave the Israelites a king in His anger, and punished them by the king they had chosen. "For with the holy, O Lord, Thou shalt be holy, and with a perfect man Thou shalt be perfect. With the clean Thou shalt be clean, and with the froward Thou shalt learn frowardness." [8]

Therefore, for the hardness of your hearts, Moses suffered you to put away your wives. But this was a mark of your degeneracy. For from the beginning it was not so. And our Lord may be supposed to say, I am come to bring things back to what they were at the beginning. I am come to soften your hard hearts. If ye will listen to Me, and not rebel against My Spirit, "I will take away your stony heart, and give you a heart of flesh."[9] Think not that I am come to destroy the Law. No; I am come to awaken its dumb voice, and to quicken its dormant spirit, and to write it on your hearts softened by divine grace. Think not to set the Law against the Gospel, and Moses against Christ. The Law is fulfilled in the Gospel, and Moses is perfected in Christ. Now, therefore, hearken to Him Who knows your thoughts, and will reply to them because He is God, and Who is the Author of the Law, and is come to restore and consummate it. For before Moses was I am. "I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

Such is the sentence of Christ.

Let us consider it attentively.

And first, let us examine this sentence. "Whosoever shall *put away* his wife, except it be for *fornication*, and shall marry another, *committeth adultery*."

Here the question arises, What does our Lord mean by *putting away?* Does He mean Divorce,—that is, dissolution

[6] Isa. lxvi. 4. Jer. ii. 19.
[7] Wisd. xi. 16.
[8] Ps. xviii. 25.
[9] Ezek. xi. 19.

of the marriage bond? or only separation of the parties, without such dissolution?

This question may be answered as follows:—

1. By reference to the inquiry of the Pharisees, Is it lawful to *put away* for every cause? By *putting away* they did *not* mean *separation* only of the parties, they meant *dissolution of the alliance*. They meant *Divorce*. They referred to the bill of divorcement, which was called a Bill of *cutting off*,[2] and which dissolved the marriage bond, with a view to a second alliance.[3] Our Lord was replying to their question; He used the same word as they had used, and He used it in the same sense. He is, therefore, speaking of *Divorce*.

Again, the word used throughout this passage, and in the parallel one, in the Sermon on the Mount, for *putting away*, is ἀπολύω, a word which always signifies in the New Testament (as its etymology suggests), to *loose from a bond*. Hence, again, we are brought to the conclusion that our Lord is speaking of *Divorce:* and His judgment is, that whosoever divorceth his wife, except for *one* cause—that of fornication—and marrieth another, committeth adultery.

But here an important question presents itself.

Our Lord appears here to specify one cause—and one only—for which the marriage bond may be dissolved, and a new alliance contracted. And in like manner, He had said in His Sermon on the Mount, in the fifth chapter of St. Matthew (ver. 32), "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *saving* for the *cause of fornication*,[4] causeth her to commit adultery."

[1] As the Divines of Rome assert, e. g. Bellarmine de Matrimonio, Christus non loquitur de dimissione quoad *vinculum*, sed solum quoad *thorum*, quando concedit dimissionem in causâ fornicationis.

[2] Deut. xxiv. 1. Hebrew, *Sepher cerithuth*, libellum *excidii*, quasi conjugii *scissionis;* a radice *carath, discidit*. Gesen. Lex., p. 417.

[3] See the form in Buxtorfii Synagoga Judaica, cap. xl. "Licita esto nubere cuivis alii viro, et hìc habe tibi libellum expulsionum." See also Grotius on Matth. v. 31, and Hammond on Divorce, Works, i. p. 595, ed. Lond. 1684.

[4] Our Lord uses the word πορνεία, and not μοιχεία, because πορνεία "comprehends those other sins of incest, &c." which μοιχεία did not. Cf. Hammond on Divorce, p. 600.

The expression is remarkable: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, save for one cause, committeth adultery."

Our Lord *affirms* that a man *is* guilty of adultery if he puts away his wife for any other cause.

But He *does not affirm* that a man does well if he puts away his wife *for this cause*. He does not *recommend* such a divorce.

All that can be said in this case is, that our Lord does *not forbid* a man to put away his wife in that one predicament.

And neither here, nor in any part of the Gospel, does our Lord permit a woman to put away her husband, and marry another. On the contrary, He says, "If a woman shall put away her husband, and be *married to another, she committeth adultery*." [5]

This is worthy of attention.

At the same time it may be *inferred*, that a man is *not* guilty of adultery, if he puts away his wife in *that* special case and marries another, just as from our Lord's saying, "*Except* ye repent, ye shall perish," it may be reasonably *inferred* that we shall not perish, if we do repent.

Such, then, is our Lord's decree, as gathered from two places in the Gospel of St. Matthew.

But now let us observe, that His judgment on Marriage and Divorce is recorded by two other Evangelists, St. Mark and St. Luke; and it is remarkable that in *neither* of those two Evangelists is *any exception* specified. But the *prohibition* of Divorce *appears to be general and absolute*. In St. Matthew, as we have seen, our Lord says twice, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, *save* for *fornication*, and marrieth another, *committeth adultery*, or causeth her to *commit adultery*." But, in St. Mark [6] and St. Luke [7] He declares, without any such reservation, that "*Whosoever* putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, *committeth adultery*."

Here, at first sight, seems to be a discrepancy.

How is it to be accounted for?

The Church of Rome hence argues that the exception

[5] Mark x. 12.

[6] Chap. x. 11.

[7] Chap. xvi. 18.

specified in *St. Matthew's* Gospel was afterwards *overruled and superseded by* our Lord's general declaration in *St. Mark and St. Luke;* and that in *no case whatever can the marriage bond be dissolved.*[8]

And yet, notwithstanding this, the Church of Rome has often given dispensations,[9] annulling the marriage contract;[1] and she even teaches, that, if one of two married persons has taken a monastic vow, the marriage tie is thereby severed;[2] and she commands that Priests who are married should be divorced.[3] And yet, at the Council of Trent, in the year 1563, she went so far as to pronounce an anathema on all who say that she is in error when she affirms that the marriage bond is indissoluble.

But what then shall we say concerning this variety in the Evangelists? Let us pray to God for grace, and

[8] See Concil. Trid. Sess. xxiv. Canon 7. Catechism. Trident. Pars ii. cap. viii. Qu. 20: Vinculum matrimonii divortio disrumpi non potest.

[9] See Sandys, Europæ Speculum, p. 41, ed. 1673; and also dispensing with the Divine Law, and allowing those to marry who are prohibited thereby, see Reform. Legum, De Gradibus in Matrim. c. 3, p. 47.

[1] And she anathematizes those who deny that she has the power of devising other causes than God has ordained in His Word as impediments to Matrimony, or for the dissolution of it. Concil. Trident. Sess. xxiv. Can. 3: Si quis dixerit, non posse Ecclesiam constituere, ut plures gradus impediant aut dirimant (quam qui in Levitico exprimuntur), anathema sit. And again, Can. 4: Si quis dixerit Ecclesiam non potuisse constituere impedimenta *matrimonium dirimentia*, vel in iis constituendis errâsse, anathema sit.

[2] Can. 6: Si quis dixerit matrimonium ratum, non consummatum, per solemnem religionis professionem alterius conjugum non dirimi, anathema sit: i. e. if, after the nuptial knot has been tied in facie Ecclesiæ, one of the parties goes off to a Monastery, instead of going home with the other party, the tie is dissolved. Or, if one of the parties has made *a profession of religion, before* the marriage, the marriage is dissolved, or rather, the knot is not tied. And even after the consummation of marriage, if both parties go into a Monastery, the Marriage is dissolved *quoad vinculum.* See Lyndwood, Provinc. p. 128: and see Bp. Barlow, Cases of Conscience, p. 70, on the Pope's dispensing Power in dissolving Marriage. It is not easy to see how such decrees, enforced with an anathema by the Council of Trent, are consistent with her doctrine that Marriage is indissoluble.

[3] Contracta matrimonia ab hujusmodi personis disjungi. Conc. Lat. i. c. 21, and Lat. ii. Decret. Dist. 27. c. 8, and see Dr. Isaac Barrow, in Christian Institutes, iv. 240.

examine His Word, and we shall find that this obscurity will become to us a source of light, and guide us on the path of duty.

1. Let us observe, that the question in St. Matthew is,[4] "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for *every cause?*"

No, is our Lord's reply, *not* for *every cause*, as is your practice. And then He specifies *one* cause in which it is *not forbidden.*

But in St. Mark the question is general. *Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?*[5] which is met by a general answer, *Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.*[6] And so in St. Luke.[7]

2. On the one hand we must not imagine, that anything spoken by our Lord to His disciples, and recorded by the Holy Spirit in any one of the Gospels, is superfluous. We must not suppose, that anything spoken by Him in the Sermon on the Mount is obsolete. Nor may we use one Gospel for the subversion of another. Christ foreknew that the Holy Spirit would write all the four Gospels, and He spake accordingly. And what Christ spake, and what the Holy Ghost, Who was sent by Christ, has written as spoken by Him, must be received by us as it was spoken by Christ, and as it is written in the Gospels by the Holy Ghost. As Ezekiel says (chap. i.) the wings of the four Evangelical Cherubin are closely interwoven, and we must not endeavour to separate them. The four Gospels make one Gospel.

3. Therefore, on the one hand, we may not say with the Church of Rome, that the exception specified by Christ, and recited twice by St. Matthew, is *no* exception at all.

4. On the other hand, we must remember that these words, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, *except* for fornication," have a peculiar character. They do *not* contain a *precept, nor* even, *directly*, a *permission.* The most that can

[4] Matt. xix. 3.
[5] Mark x. 2.
[6] Mark x. 11.
[7] Chap. xvi. 18.

be said of them, is, that Divorce, which *is* prohibited in *all* other cases, is *not* prohibited in that *one* case. And so by implication it may be said to be tolerated in that case. But let us remember that (as a wise man says) "God approves much more than He commands, and disapproves much more than He forbids."[8] In *no case* does God *approve* Divorce. And may we not say that in all cases He rather regards it with disapproval? For Christ has expressly declared in general terms, in the Gospel of St. Matthew, in the chapter before us, *What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*[9] He thus intimates His *general desire,* and gives His *universal counsel,* that the husband should not proceed to a Divorce, and to a second Marriage, but that a place should be left to an erring wife for repentance and reconciliation.

This conclusion is also confirmed by our Lord's teaching and practice on other occasions. He did not reject the penitential sorrow of the woman who had been a sinner, but even allowed her to minister to His own blessed body.[1] And when He wrote with His finger on the ground, and when He said to the woman taken in adultery, *Go, and sin no more,*[2] He seemed to indicate the hardness of the hearts on which He had written His law concerning Marriage, and He intimated a desire that, on her sincere repentance, a door might be open to reconciliation, and that the bond of marriage might not be broken by Divorce.

Such was the general desire of Christ.

5. And now let us see, how beautifully this desire is brought out by the fact which before may have perplexed us —that the *exception* recited by St. Matthew is *not* mentioned in the two other Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke. How instructive is this omission! How eloquent is this silence! You perceive how it is to be interpreted. Not that Christ has revoked the permission, or rather the *non-prohibition,* in St. Matthew. Not that He unsays in one Gospel what He has said in another. No. He is "the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last,"[3] the eternal "Yea and Amen." *Heaven*

[8] Hooker, III. viii. 5.
[9] Matt. xix. 6. Mark x. 9.
[1] Luke vii. 37—39.
[2] John viii. 11.
[3] Rev. i. 8.

and earth shall pass away, but His words shall never pass away.[4] Nor, again, that the Holy Ghost had forgotten what Christ said. The Holy Ghost was sent to *bring* to the *remembrance* of Christ's *disciples all that He had said to them.*[5] No. But for an admirable purpose, which ought to be borne in mind by us. We must take all the Gospels together. Observe what instruction may be derived from their variety and from their unity. We see in St. Matthew that a man may not divorce his wife, and marry another, save for a particular sin. He is, therefore, not forbidden to divorce her for *that* sin. *If* we had St. Matthew's Gospel *alone*, we might perhaps imagine that Christ *approves* what He does not forbid. We might perhaps have said that He looks with complacency on Divorce and re-Marriage in one particular case; and thus we should see Him opposed to the God of the Old Testament, Who made the man and the woman to be *one flesh*, and *hateth putting away*.[6] But by God's goodness, we have two other Gospels, those of St. Mark and St. Luke. They supply what he omits; they supply, even by omission—as here. In them it is said absolutely that "whosoever divorceth his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery." And why? Not because Christ has changed His mind, and forbids now what He had not forbidden before; but in order to teach us that God will be better pleased with us, if we abstain from doing that which He does not forbid us to do.[7]

This conclusion is confirmed by the authority of the Holy

[4] Luke xxi. 33. [5] John xiv. 26.

[6] Gen. ii. 24. Mal. ii. 16. After all that has been written on this text, this appears to be its true sense. See Drusius and W. Lowth, ad locum, and Grotius, in Matth. v. 31.

[7] One very strong reason for which divorces for adultery with a view to second marriages are inexpedient, has been well stated by S. Augustine ad Pollent. de Conjug. Adulter. ii. 18, "Ne discant *viri* uxores suas, quas propter alias innumerabiles causas ferre non possunt, *mœchari cogere*, ut, ab eis vinculo conjugali per fornicationem, sicut putas, soluto, liceat eis alteras ducere." In corroboration of this remark, it is observable that Lord Eldon stated (May 16, 1800, in the House of Lords), "That nine out of every ten cases of adultery that came into the courts below, or that bar, were founded in the most *infamous collusion*," i.e. between husband and wife.

Spirit speaking by St. Paul.[8] *Unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord* (that is, in the Gospels, as we have seen), *Let not the wife depart* (or procure a Divorce) *from her husband. But and if she depart* (or be put away upon any cause), *let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife.*

Thus the *exception* in St. Matthew, and the *omission* of it in St. Mark and St. Luke, when considered together, convey to us Divine instruction. The Evangelic records are in perfect harmony. They teach us by their voices—and teach us by their silence. And happy would it be for the world if its ear were duly attentive to the heavenly music of their holy wisdom. How peaceful would be the state of families! How loving would be the intercourse of Husbands and Wives, of Parents and of Children! And this harmony of homes would diffuse itself in ever-enlarging circles in Cities and in Nations, and throughout the World. Then those sins would be unknown which now bring shame and anguish upon families; and which, if they are not checked, but grow more strong, and extend themselves more widely among us, will spread misery and ruin, and bring down God's wrath upon us as guilty of profaning that holy Ordinance which He instituted at the Creation, and which has been adorned with new dignity by His beloved Son. May He pour His grace into our hearts, and teach us to see, and enable us to do His Will! May He rescue us from impending dangers, and lead us in the path of Truth and Love!

Thus we may mount by an angelic ladder from a right understanding of earthly Marriage to a true knowledge of that wedlock which is heavenly, spiritual, and eternal. We may ascend from the type to the antitype; from the first Adam to the Second; from Eve in the garden of Eden to the Universal Church in glory; from the Institution of Marriage in Paradise to its final consummation in Heaven.

Let us now examine whether the conclusion at which we have arrived is sanctioned by the authority of those whose judgments are entitled to respectful consideration.

[8] 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

Our assertion is, that a man is *not forbidden* to put away his wife and to contract a second marriage, if his wife has been guilty of adultery, and if she has been divorced by judicial sentence for that sin; and if he himself has not been guilty of it.

Some of the Fathers of the Church, especially of the Latin Church, and particularly St. Augustine, argued from Mark x. 11, Luke xvi. 18, where the exception (save for fornication) is not recited, that the Marriage bond is in *all cases indissoluble.* But in reviewing his own writings (Retract. ii. c. 57) on this subject, he confessed that he had not satisfied himself: "non me pervenisse ad hujus rei perfectionem sentio."

Others of the Latin Fathers concluded from our Lord's words that Marriage is dissoluble in that case. See Tertullian, c. Marcion. iv. 34, ad Uxorem, lib. ii. c. 3: Divortium prohibet (Christus) nisi stupri causâ. Lactantius, Institut. vi. 23, and Epitome, c. 66, asserts that the adultery of a wife justifies a divorce *a vinculo.*

Among the Greek Fathers, St. Basil allows a divorce for adultery: see Epist. 188. canon 9, tom. iii. p. 274, ed. Bened. St. Chrysostom may be cited as taking the same view (Hom. xvii. on St. Matthew). So St. Epiphanius (Hæres. lix. vol. i. part i. p. 497), on which passage even Petavius, the learned Jesuit, allows, vol. ii. p. ii. p. 255, that the innocent party was then allowed to marry after Divorce; he quotes the 10th Canon of the first Council of Arles for that usage, and shows that though the Church advised a person, who had put away his wife for adultery, not to marry another, but rather to endeavour to reclaim and restore his fallen partner, she did not forbid him to do so.

Theodoret (Bishop of Cyrus A.D. 420) says, that Christ forbids the Dissolution of Marriage, save for one cause (adultery), which *severs the bond,* μίαν ἀφορμὴν διαλύσεως ἔδωκε, τὴν ἀληθῶς διασπῶσαν τὴν ζεύγλην (Græc. Affect. Curat. ix. vol. iv. p. ii. p. 944, ed. Hal. 1772. See also ibid. Hæret. Fab. Compend. lib. v. 16, p. 436, and v. 25, p. 466).

Even our own St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, as late as the seventh century, says, in a remarkable letter

(Epist 87, Bibl. Patr. Lugd. xiii. 107), that Augustine had by no means satisfied him: "Nihil planè elucidationis certè nostræ omninò teneritudini captabile profert." And it appears from his letter, that even in the Western Church, in the seventh century, Marriage was not forbidden, after Divorce, to the *innocent* party.

Euthymius Zygabenus, on Matt. v. 32, says, "Our Lord forbids men to Divorce their wives *save* for adultery; and He does not allow the divorced woman to marry another man. And whosoever divorces his wife, except for adultery, is the cause of the adultery which she commits by marriage with another man, who is guilty of adultery in marrying one who is another's wife."

The celebrated Roman Catholic Jurist, Thomassinus (Eccl. Discipl. iv. p. 499, De Beneficiis, Pt. II. lib. i. cap. lxxviii.) does not scruple to affirm that in primitive times Divorce and a *second marriage* were allowed to an *innocent* man for the wife's adultery: "Non modò civili et Romano jure licita erant liberaque repudia, sed in *ipsâ Ecclesiâ prioribus sæculis* aliquandiu visum est quamplurimis ab *innocuo marito* posse repudiari uxorem, adulterii convictam, et *aliam duci.*"

And the same opinion has been confirmed with a large amount of ancient testimony by another learned Roman Catholic writer, Launoy, in his treatise "De regiâ in matrimonium potestate," (Opera, vol. i. pars 2, p. 625; cp. vol. iv. pars 2, p. 132, ed. Colon. 1731.)

Bingham, xvi. 11, says, "The Ecclesiastical Laws admitted of divorces only in case of adultery and malicious desertion. In the case of adultery, women as well as men were allowed to divorce themselves from the offending party, as appears from the case related by Justin Martyr (Apol. i. p. 42), and out of him by Eusebius, iv. 17."

The Greek Church from "the most ancient times" allowed the innocent party to marry: see Sarpi, Concilio di Trento, ad A.D. 1563, p. 773.

Bp. Hall, A.D. 1650, Decade iv. "In Cases of Conscience resolved," Case 3, "Whether after a lawful divorce for adultery, the innocent party may marry again?" says,—

"Shortly, then, I doubt not but I may (notwithstanding great authorities to the contrary) safely resolve, that in the case of Divorce *it is lawful for the innocent person* to marry. But for that I find the Church of England hitherto somewhat tender in the point; and this practice, where it rarely falls, generally held, though not sinful, yet of ill report, and obnoxious to various censures; I should therefore earnestly advise and exhort those whom it may concern, carefully and effectually to apply themselves to the fore-mentioned remedies; Reconciliation, if it be possible, to prevent a Divorce; Holy endeavours of a continued continence (if it may be obtained) to prevent a second marriage after Divorce: but if these prevail not, I dare not lay a load upon any man's conscience which God hath not burdened; *I dare not ensnare those whom God will have free.*"

Ibid., p. 850, the Bishop says wisely,—

"The Pharisees' question ('Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?') was not without a plain implication of liberty to marry another: which our Saviour well knowing, gives a full answer as well to what he meant as what he said; which had not been perfectly satisfactory if He had only determined that one part concerning dimission, and not the other concerning marriage, which clause if two other Evangelists (St. Mark and St. Luke) express not, yet it must be fetched necessarily from the third (St. Matthew), since it is a sure and irrefragable rule, *that all four Evangelists make up one perfect Gospel.*"

Dr. Hammond, "Of Divorces," vol. i. p. 595, says,—

"The occasion of this doubt (whether a man may divorce his wife for adultery and marry again) is the variety of the words, wherein the speech of Christ's is expressed in the Gospels;

"For as Matt. xix. 9, the words are, that, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, save for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery:' which are favourable to the affirmative, That it is lawful for him in that one excepted case to marry again: so Mark x. 11 and Luke xvi. 18, the exception is left out, and the words are the same

in both, absolutely delivered, 'Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery;'

"That these places, that in Matthew on one side, and in the other two Evangelists, at least in St. Mark, on the other side, are a report of the same passage of story, and of the same part of Christ's speech, appealing from the Mosaical permission, to the first institution of marriage, there is no ground of making any question. And therefore it follows, that one must be interpreted by the other; either St. Matthew by the other two, or the other two by St. Matthew;

"That Matthew should be interpreted by the other two (the more explicit and large by the shorter and less explicit) seems not reasonable. And besides, it were not easily imaginable, what should become of those words in Matthew, both xix. 9 and v. 32 (except for fornication) if the full sense were expressed by Mark and Luke without them: for though it be easy to conceive such words to be meant, when they are not expressed, yet it is not so easy to conceive them not to be meant, when they are expressed.

"In this difficulty thus argued on both sides, the Resolution, I suppose, will be made by these propositions,

1. "That by the force of Christ's words in all the Evangelists, he that marries again after any kind of Divorce, but that one for fornication, doth commit an unchristian sin; and that at least of a double adultery, one in taking a new wife whilst the former liveth (which is formally adulterous), the other in deserting (and denying the duty of marriage to) the rejected wife of his youth, which may be casually adultery in her, and in the mean while is an injustice joined with wandering lust;

2. "That by the force of the arguments first produced for the interpreting Mark and Luke, by Matt. xix. 9, it may be probably concluded, That in that one case of divorce for fornication, the marriage of the innocent party shall not be adulterous.

3. "That although this be granted, yet the words of Mark and Luke, and especially the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 39, do give such prejudices against marriages after Divorce indefinitely, that the ancient canons of the

Church of God, and the constitutions of our English Reformation, have thought fit not to permit such liberty in any kind."

But Hammond speaks more clearly in his "Practical Catechism," book ii. sect. vii.

"Is no kind of Divorce now lawful under Christ?

"Yes, clearly, that which is here named (Matt. xix. 3), in case of fornication."

Herbert Thorndike, "On the Laws of the Church," A.D. 1659, book iii. chap. xiii. sect. 29, thus speaks,—

"It is not possible to show, that ever there was any opinion, rule, or practice, received in the Church, that it is lawful to divorce but in case of adultery. I do truly conceive that there was anciently a difference of opinion and practice in the Church, whether it be lawful to marry again upon putting away a wife for adultery, or whether the bond of marriage remain indissoluble, when the parties are separated from bed and board for adultery. But this difference argues consent in the rest; that is, that excepting the case of adultery, there is no divorce to be among Christians."

Bishop Taylor's opinion (A.D. 1659) is that Marriage may be dissolved for Adultery, as may be seen in his *Ductor Dubitantium,* chap. v. rule viii.

Bishop Cosin affirmed that by the Law of Christ a man might put away his wife for adultery, and marry again.

That "this freedom of marrying again is not allowed to the adulteress." See his argument on the Dissolution of Marriage, Parl. History, iv. p. 447. State Trials, xiii. 1283, 1332. Works, vol. iv. p. 498, 450, ed. Oxf. 1851. (A.D. 1669.)

Bishop Horsley said, in his Speech in the House of Lords on the Adultery Prevention Bill, 1800,—

"This inference from experience is founded on a comparison of the manners of the women in this country, where the practice of divorce for cause of Adultery obtains, with the manners of married women in foreign countries professing the Roman Catholic Religion, which allows not of divorce for any cause. It is said that in those countries Adultery is far more frequent; and this greater frequency

of the crime is ascribed to the absolute disuse and prohibition of divorce in those countries.

"My Lords, I am very ready to believe the fact, and very ready to admit that the true cause is assigned for it: because I can easily imagine, that women will be less strict, where they know, that be their conduct ever so bad, their husbands cannot cast them off, but are still under the necessity of supporting them as their wives, and must father the offspring."

On the whole, it is very doubtful whether the cause of Holy Matrimony can be safely grounded and successfully defended on the plea of entire Indissolubility. Our appeal must be to the original text of Holy Scripture. And, to say the least, it is very doubtful, whether Holy Scripture, understood in its plain grammatical sense, will bear any one out in urging the plea of Indissolubility.

If it does not, let not Holy Scripture be invoked as if it did sanction it.

If the cord is strained too tightly, it will break in our hands. If, in dealing with this grave and solemn question, we endeavour to apply Holy Scripture where it is not fairly applicable, we shall not be able to apply it where it ought to be applied. The ground of Holy Scripture will be cut away from under us, and then where shall we have any footing left?

We cannot find it in a few sentences quoted from some Latin Fathers. And in arguing this question in England, we shall derive no benefit, but rather the contrary, from finding ourselves in the company of the Church of Rome and of the Council of Trent.

PART II.

ON MARRIAGE WITH A DIVORCED PERSON.

We now arrive at the second question; What is the meaning of our Lord's words, "Whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery"?

In order to answer this inquiry, let us observe, that our Blessed Saviour repeats this sentence three times in the Gospels. The Holy Spirit in reiterating it marks its solemn importance. We read in St. Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount, "Whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."[1] We read again in St. Matthew, "Whosoever marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."[2] We read again in St. Luke, "Whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery."[3]

1. Now, it is worthy of remark, that the word in the original of all these three passages for *divorced* or *put away*, is one and the same, *ἀπολελυμένη*. This word signifies *loosed from a bond*.[4] It is applied in the Gospels to the woman loosed from the bonds of sickness.[5] It is used to signify dissolution by death, as in the Song of Simeon,[6]

[1] Matt. v. 32. [2] Matt. xix. 9.

[3] Luke xvi. 18.

[4] *Absoluta.* Some of the *Latin* Fathers would have been saved from much of the perplexity which has entangled them in their arguments on this great question of Marriage and Divorce, if they had resorted to the *Greek original* in this text, and not to their own *Latin Translation* here, "*dimissam à viro*," which seems to fail in two important respects: (1) by not marking the absence of the definite article, and, (2) by rendering *ἀπολελυμένην* by the inadequate and much weaker word *dimissam*.

Ἀπολύω = *Absolvo*, whence the word *Absolution;* and all the Latin Fathers would agree that it would be theologically unsound to *deny* that Almighty God *looses* the penitent sinner from the *bond* of sin (*à vinculo peccati*) by the Ministry of *Absolution*.

It would be an interesting subject for inquiry,

What *would have been* the reasonings of the great logician and theologian of the African Church, St. Augustine, on Marriage and Divorce, if he had argued from the inspired Greek; or had read in his translation, "Quicunque *solutam* (not *dimissam*), à viro duxerit, mœchatur."

St. Augustine (as before stated) in reviewing his own writings (Retractationes, ii. c. 57), indicates that he had not quite satisfied himself in his argument concerning Marriage. "Scripsi," he says, "duos libros de conjugiis adulterinis cupiens solvere difficillimam quæstionem. Quod utrum enodatissimè fecerim nescio; imò verò *non* me *pervenisse* ad hujus rei perfectionem sentio."

The failing, thus candidly confessed, was not in the workman, but in the instrument with which he worked—the Latin Vulgate, instead of the Greek Original.

[5] Luke xiii. 12. [6] Luke ii. 29.

"Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace." It is used of liberation from prison, as where Pilate is said to release to the people a prisoner, whom they would.[7]

2. It is also to be observed that in all the three places in the Gospels before recited, where the word rendered "divorced," or "put away," occurs, this word ἀπολελυμένη stands absolutely; that is, it is not preceded by the definite article to limit it to a particular case. It therefore means, universally and without exception, *any* divorced woman whatsoever. As has been remarked by a learned Bishop of the English Church, Bishop Middleton, in his treatise on the use of the Article in the Greek Testament, "The true meaning of the word is, *any one* that is divorced;" and he rightly adds, "we must not render it, *her* that is divorced," that is, divorced for any particular cause, whether just or unjust, but generally, "*any one* that is divorced," and he well adds, "the principle of this distinction is important."[8]

3. The meaning therefore of our Lord is, Whosoever marrieth any woman that has been put away from her husband committeth adultery.

The woman, is supposed by our Lord to have been put away by her husband.

She is either innocent, or not. If she is innocent, then she has been wrongfully put away; he may, it is true, have put her away; and in the times when our Lord was speaking, wives were put away by their husbands on very slight grounds. But a wife, who has been wrongfully put away, cannot make herself a party to a Divorce. For thus she would plead guilty to a crime which, by her Saviour's law, is the only cause for Divorce. Her husband, indeed, may treat her as no longer his wife; but she cannot regard him as no longer her husband.

And the Laws of her Country will protect her in this

[7] Matt. xxvii. 15, 17, 21—26. Mark xv. 6. Luke xxii. 68; xxiii, 16, 17. John xviii. 39. Acts iii. 13; iv. 21. Heb. xiii. 23.

[8] So likewise *Winer* in his Greek Grammar of the New Testament Leipsic, 1855, 6th edit. p. 111, rightly observes that the text of St. Luke is to be translated "he who marries any woman that has been divorced from a husband."

vindication of herself. They will defend Womanhood. They will guard Marriage. They will not allow a man, who puts away his wife wrongfully, to marry again. They will not tempt the woman to treat herself as if she were an adulteress, by regarding her as divorced, and by affording her facilities of re-marriage. For Christ Himself has said, "He that marrieth a woman that hath been put away by her husband committeth adultery."

But, suppose the other alternative.

Suppose the woman to be guilty. And suppose she is put away for adultery. Is she not justly put away? Has she not *ceased to be a wedded wife?* How then, in that case, are we to understand the words of Christ? "He that marrieth a woman that hath been put away committeth adultery."

Here seems to be a paradox; but here is a divine truth; and we need not hesitate to say, that the neglect of the divine truth contained in these words of our Lord has led to much misery and vice. And a due regard for it, in Legislation and Administration of Justice, would do much to restore Wedlock to its divine sanctity, and to banish Adultery from the world. May God grant that in any measures which may now be adopted in our own Land, the voice of this Truth may be heard.

For what is Adultery? It is a breach of the Marriage-contract. And what is Marriage? Our Lord replies, "They twain shall be one flesh." Therefore union with an Adulteress is union in Adultery.

And what let us ask, is the cause of adultery? Where is its spring and root? It is to be found in the treacherous arts of the seducer, and in a guilty passion for him. She who has plighted her troth to another is tempted by Satan and falls. Now, let us remember that by the Law of God under the Old dispensation a woman who was false to her husband was *not allowed to marry her seducer.* No, she was *not even allowed to live.* The command of Almighty God, written in His Holy Word, is—"The adulterer and adulteress shall surely be *put to death;* so shalt thou put away evil from Israel."[9]

[9] Lev. xx. 10. Deut. xxii. 22. John viii. 5.

Christ did not come to destroy the moral law, but to fulfil it. He came, indeed, to mitigate its rigour, but not to impair its virtue. He came to give new dignity to Marriage; but the Son of God, the Divine Bridegroom of the Church, did not come into the world to give new privileges to Adultery.

Suppose now, that the *penalty* of *death* is removed. And in our own age and country, it is not inflicted. Adultery is not visited with death. But is its guilt the less on that account? Surely not. And, suppose that if a woman commits this sin, she thereby acquires permission to marry him who has tempted her to commit it, or to form any other new alliance that she may desire. Suppose (as, alas! is now proposed) that such a marriage as this sanctioned by the authoritative voice of the Legislature, and by the august forms of a judicial Tribunal, constituted for that purpose; then what a powerful incentive might she have to be false! She may be ill at ease with her husband; they may be ill-matched in age, ill assorted in temper, in pursuits, in tastes, in dispositions; the husband may be sullen and morose; her home may be cheerless and comfortless. Instead of endeavouring, like Abigail, to bear her burden with resignation; and instead of praying, like St. Augustine's mother Monica,[1] with fervent sighs and tears to God, for the divine influence of the Holy Ghost to soften her husband's heart, and to make her gracious and lovely in his sight, and so winning him to herself and to Christ—she may be tempted to look elsewhere; estrangement may lead to aversion; she may imagine that she will be more happy—yes, that she will be even more holy—in another alliance. The Laws of her country, and its venerable Judicature, will seem to offer it to her as a refuge from the storm—a wished-for haven of domestic peace. The Enemy of her soul, in the person of

[1] The beautiful picture drawn by St. Augustine's hand, of his mother's behaviour to her husband and her mother-in-law (Confessions, ix. 9), may be contemplated by all with benefit and delight; and may be commended to the attention of any who may desire to legalize facilities of divorce. What might Monica have been,—what might her husband have been, what might her mother-in-law, what might St. Augustine have been,—if such facilities for divorce had existed among Christians then?

her seducer, will be at her ear to whisper soft hopes into her heart. The end will seem to justify the means. An act of deadly sin will become to her like a work of spiritual emancipation. Adultery will be *transformed* into an *angel of light*.[2] It will promise to release her from the thraldom of a hated union, and to open to her the door of another home, which fascinates her with fair visions, and enchants her with delusive dreams of peace, happiness, and love.

Is there not, therefore, Divine wisdom in the words, "He that marrieth her that has been put away committeth adultery."

An adulteress, put away for adultery, is in a penal state. She has been put away *from* her husband, but she has not been put away *to* a new husband: she has been cast off as a blighted branch, but not to be grafted on a new tree.[3] Her *injured* husband may be free to marry again; but *she* has not *acquired a like freedom by injuring him*. No, rather she is like those branches that are *cast into the fire and burned*.[4] Our blessed Lord might and did cast off His first spouse the Jewish Church, for spiritual fornication, and He espoused to Himself another, the Gentile Church. But the Jewish Church did not acquire by its Divorce from God a right to be joined to another Husband. No, she was cast out till she returns to Christ by repentance; and then indeed, and then only, is there hope, that God will have mercy upon her. But let it be remembered that an adulteress, by God's law, was to be *put to death*. She is a tainted person. He who unites himself with her, he who makes himself *one flesh with her*, is partner in her guilt. Union with an adulteress is adultery,

In fact he who marries her, may be said to be a cause of her adultery. For if she had been precluded from the prospect of a second marriage purchaseable by Divorce consequent on Adultery, she would probably not have been an adulteress. She would not have fallen; she would have

[2] 2 Cor. xi. 14.

[3] Hence St. Chrysostom says, "An Adulteress is no man's wife" (De libello repudii, iii. p. 207, ed. Montfaucon).

[4] John xv. 6.

stood firm; she would have been safe from the temptation which was offered her by the view of that second marriage. If there were no second marriages purchaseable by adultery, adultery would scarcely exist. The hope of the second marriage is the root of the sin. Well therefore does the Divine Lawgiver eradicate it by saying, "Whoso marrieth a divorced woman committeth adultery."

But what, it may now be said, is to be done with the guilty party?

To which question we may first say, "Why should she be guilty? Who constrains her to sin? Everything in this world and the next world deters her from it. And if the door of second marriage is not opened to her by the hand of men, it is not probable that she will sin." [5] When men put such a question as this, "What shall be done with the guilty party?" they betray and condemn themselves; they show that they have a very low and unworthy notion of the dignity, sanctity, and beauty of womanhood, and of those safeguards, with which even Nature itself, and much more the protecting hand of Grace has encompassed her, as it were, with ministering angels waiting on her steps, and guiding her in the path of duty.

But if this question must needs be put, and must needs be answered, we must say again that God has declared in His law that adultery is punishable with death. And surely the person, who takes away the charm of life, is scarcely less

[5] St. Chrysostom, in his xviith Homily on St. Matthew observes,—

"Our Lord by saying, 'He that marrieth a woman that has been put away committeth adultery,' makes even the viciously disposed woman to be chaste, by altogether blocking up against her all ingress to any other man (*πρὸς ἕτερον ἄνδρα πάντως ἀποτειχίζων εἴσοδον αὐτῇ*), and not allowing her to give occasions of petty jealousies. For the wife, having learnt that it is absolutely necessary for her to keep the husband who has once fallen to her lot, and that in case of her being cast off from his house, she has no other asylum, even against her will learns to love her husband.

"He also makes the Law easy (to the husband) in another way. For He leaves him one mode of divorce (*ἀφέσεως*) by saying, 'except for the cause of fornication.' For if He had commanded the man to retain an adulteress, adultery would have again been the result, and He *allows him to put her away for this cause, and for no other.*"

guilty than one who takes away life itself: the person who destroys the peace and happiness of a household at once, and blights and withers the fair name and tender hopes of innocent children, can scarcely be said to be guilty of a less offence, than one who takes away life. A murderer destroys one life, but an adulterer or adulteress destroys what is best worth living for, and what is most precious in many lives.

Accordingly both heathen and Christian nations[6] have punished adultery by death. And our own Reformers, declared in the *Reformatio Legum*[7] that the adulterer and adulteress should be condemned to perpetual exile or imprisonment; and that after a divorce for adultery the guilty party should not be allowed to contract a second Marriage.

The only remedy for sin is Repentance; and there is no sin so deadly that may not be washed away by the tears of Repentance and by the Blood of Christ. "The Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.[8] But except we repent, we shall perish."[9] Let no one therefore imagine that the way to procure pardon and peace for any who have fallen, or may fall, into the sin of adultery, is to open to them the door of a second Marriage. No, of all the cruel mercies that were ever devised by the Evil One, this is one of the worst. It rivets the chains of sin, and renders repentance a difficulty, and chains two persons together in the bonds of iniquity.

One more consideration. Experience confirms too strongly the opinions now stated concerning the meaning of our Lord's words, "Whosoever marrieth her that has been put away committeth adultery."

On the one hand, there is great danger in the position taken up by the Church of Rome that marriage cannot be dissolved even for adultery, which is encouraged by the

[6] See Tacitus, Germ. xix. Bingham, xvi. 11.

[7] Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum (ed. Oxon. 1851, p. 50), De Adulteriis et Divortiis.

[8] 1 John i. 7.

[9] Luke xiii. 3, 5.

assurance it gives to women that, however vicious they may be, they cannot be divorced for their sin.

Some nations of Europe, which are under the sway of the Church of Rome, are now a warning to us in this respect: and doubtless their moral condition affords us a solemn caution, lest by avoiding one extreme we should run hastily into the other; and lest we should altogether abolish that which, on account of human sin, Christ himself allows, in order to show our zeal for the maintenance of what He commands. But this being borne in mind, there is doubtless great danger to be feared on the other side.

In those countries where the true meaning of our Lord's words "Whosoever marrieth a divorced woman committeth adultery," is disregarded, and where a second marriage is purchaseable by Divorce, and Divorce is purchaseable by Adultery, there the private and public results of such a permission have been almost too disastrous to describe.

A speech was delivered in the Legislative Assembly of Prussia, in the year 1857, by a high legal functionary of that kingdom, who has presided for nearly forty years in Matrimonial Causes in that realm, and states publicly the results of the facilities there given for Divorce, and for enabling the guilty party to contract a second marriage.[1]

"The number of Divorces," he says, "every year amounts to about three thousand in this country, or ten a day; and if you allow three children to each of these marriages, this gives from nine to ten thousand children annually whose parents are divorced." And he quotes the report he had received from a Prussian pastor, even of a rural district, where the baneful influence of the law has been less felt than in the great towns, and who says, that "the certainty of being able to obtain a Divorce looses the marriage tie among the great mass of the people, and helps to weaken the sense of duty to practise a loving forbearance and self-denial, and tends by degrees to bring about first an inward, and then an actual, breach of the marriage vow."[2] He

[1] Baron Von Gerlach. Speech in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies on the Divorce Bill, Feb. 23, 1857, p. 10.

[2] Page 12.

states also that the consciences of the Clergy were greatly distressed, as they well might be, by a law which called upon them to pronounce the marriage benediction on persons divorced for the breach of the marriage vow.

These facts may be left to speak for themselves.

Hitherto, no Tribunal has existed in England for Divorce and re-marriage.

Our Country, like a wise parent, says to us, Take heed how you enter the Marriage State, for when you have once entered it, there is no exit from it, but by death. Therefore "deliberandum est diu, quod statuendum est semel."

And the Church of Christ in this land reminds us that Marriage is to be approached with godly fear. Her language is that of sternness—but it is the sternness of a mother's love. She speaks to us of joy in Marriage, but of joy derived from discharge of duty. "Marriage," she says, "is honourable among all men, and therefore is not by any to be entertained nor taken in hand lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." It is the most solemn act that you can perform between birth and death. And this, not merely for your own sake, because it will be to you either a great blessing or a great bane—and your own welfare, both in time and eternity, may be here at stake—but also because the welfare, temporal and eternal, of other immortal beings is here involved—that of your future wife, to be made one with yourself, that of your children, and children's children. It is therefore no light thing to undertake the responsibilities of a husband and a father. And if you enter upon them rashly, you are guilty of cruelty toward man, and of irreverence toward God. Hence the Church of Christ in her Ritual, and our Country in her Laws—though now, alas! with a faltering voice—speaks to us in the words of solemn warning.

And yet Marriages even now are often contracted unadvisedly; and we see the wretched consequences of such recklessness. But thanks be to God, some Marriages, which appeared to be most improvident in their beginning, may, and often do, become happy in their continuance and in their end, *under the influence of the indissolubility of Mar-*

riage. It has been well said[3] that "when two persons understand that they must live together"—that they are inseparably united for better or for worse—"they learn to soften by mutual accommodation the yoke which they know they cannot shake off; they become *good* husbands and *good* wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives. For Necessity is a powerful Master in teaching the duties it imposes."

And may we not add, that some of the most beautiful examples of human patience, tenderness, and love, which the angels who are in heaven now behold in this lower world of ours, are seen in the mutual forbearance and self-sacrifice of husbands and wives? They bear one another's burdens, and help one another's infirmities. They cherish one another in sorrow, they comfort one another in sickness, and soothe one another in trouble, and refresh one another in weariness, and cheer one another onward on the way to heaven.

Here is a holy discipline of our tempers; here is an exercise of our virtues; and here is an increase of our graces, and an earnest of our glory. Here, it may be, is present suffering; but here also is a bright hope of future joy. These domestic trials on earth are the leaves and flowers of which our heavenly crown is to be woven.

Yet, after all, assuredly, there are unhappy marriages, for which no such remedies are found.

True. But is the welfare of a Community to be sacrificed, because some persons in it suffer from their own rashness, and because they are not willing to *apply* the *remedies* which the Gospel of Christ affords to alleviate the unhappiness consequent on their own imprudence? Is the Law of God to be broken, and His Wrath to be incurred by a Nation, because some individuals in it may have despised His counsel, and may desire to abrogate His statutes?

No; this is not the way to promote the happiness of a Community, nor of any individuals in it.

For, suppose that opportunities should be afforded for Divorce, and for the formation of new matrimonial alliances

[3] By Lord Stowell, in the case of Evans *v.* Evans.

by the parties separated from each other—suppose that a new Judicial Tribunal (as now proposed) should be constituted for this purpose, and that Divorce were made easy; suppose that *Divorce* and *Re-marriage* were (as is designed) to be *made purchaseable by Adultery*, then, is it not to be feared, that many more persons, than is now the case, will be made miserable by reckless marriages? The knot being easy to be untied, less care will be taken in tying it. And ill-advised marriages, having been once contracted, will not then have those healing means of recovery which are now supplied by the indissolubility of Marriage, and by God's grace acting with it; they will become daily more irksome and intolerable; and the sin of Adultery, which brings down God's judgments on families and Nations, will become common and familiar; temptations to it will even be offered to wives by their own husbands, in order that the one may be liberated from the other, and that both may be free to form a new alliance; Adultery will be welcomed by many as a release from a hard bondage, and be almost consecrated as a Virtue.

From such calamities as these may God deliver us!

Therefore, by the mercies of Christ Who redeemed you, and for the love of the souls whom He hath redeemed, be not persuaded to encourage facilities for Divorce. In the eye of our Lord and Saviour such facilities as these are facilities for Adultery. They are facilities for shame and misery in Time and Eternity. Let us earnestly supplicate our Rulers—the appointed Guardians under God of our public happiness and virtue—to preserve our fellow-country-women, our dear sisters in Jesus Christ, from the dangerous temptations which such facilities would afford. Let us implore them rather, to renounce the invidious privilege, and abolish the evil example, of granting Divorces to the Rich. Disturb not the peace of Families, sully not the honour, offend not the modesty of English matrons, by offering them temptations to disgrace. Death is far preferable to such ignominy as that. In the case supposed—the commission of the sin of unfaithfulness—the penitential sorrow of a contrite heart is the only remedy. *That*, we

know, may prevail through the merits of Christ. She who has been tempted to fall may find pardon and peace, if she comes to Him, and bathes His feet with her tears, and wipes them with her hair. A reconciliation may take place; the *Valley of Achor* may become a *Door of Hope* (Hos. ii. 18), and *there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.*

But all other paths lead to the gate of death. And it is not mercy—no, it is not mercy,—though it may assume that sacred name,—it is rather heartless cruelty—to beguile an unhappy woman from the only true way of recovery and happiness,—the way of Repentance;—and to decoy her into a false way, the way of Re-marriage, and so to tempt her to everlasting destruction.

We urge this plea, therefore, even on behalf of the guilty. We would urge a similar plea in behalf of innocent children, the offspring of those who may be tempted to sin by facilities of divorce and re-marriage, and thus reduce those children to a worse state than that of orphans. "For the glory of a man is from the honour of his father, and a mother in dishonour is a reproach to the children" (Ecclus. iii. 11).

We here also make a solemn appeal in behalf of our Spiritual Mother, the Church. Shall the Clergy be required to solemnize such second marriages as these? Shall the Ministers of the Bride of Christ be invited to pronounce a blessing on marriages which her Lord condemns as adulterous? Heaven forbid! If the Church permits this, she herself will be rejected as an adulteress.

Let the Clergy remember the following history; it is very instructive. About two centuries and a half ago a Marriage such as has been described took place in the neighbourhood of London.[4] It was solemnized by a clergyman, then young,[5] who became afterwards a Prebendary of this Church of Westminster, and subsequently Bishop of this City, and Archbishop of Canterbury, and at length laid down his life with courage and constancy on the block, Archbishop Laud. He was persuaded by some considerations, especially by importunate solicitations of powerful friends, to celebrate

[4] Dec. 26, 1605, at Wanstead.

[5] See Heylin's Life of Archbishop Laud, p. 59.

the marriage of a guilty divorced party with another. But soon afterwards his conscience smote him; he rued with bitter remorse and contrition what he had done; and he set apart the day on which he had been betrayed into this sin (St. Stephen's day), as a day of annual self-abasement and penitential sorrow. He wrote this prayer for his own use on that sad anniversary: "Lord, I beseech Thee for the mercies of Jesus Christ, enter not into judgment with me Thy servant; but hear His Blood imploring Thy mercies for me; neither let this Marriage prove a Divorcing of my soul from Thy grace and favour. O Lord, how grievous is the remembrance of my sin, after so many and such reiterated prayers poured forth unto Thee from a sorrowful and afflicted spirit; be merciful, O Lord, unto me, hearken to the prayers of Thy humble and dejected servant, and raise me up again, O Lord, that I may not die in this my sin, but that I may live in Thee hereafter, and living evermore rejoice in Thee, through the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ my Lord and Saviour. Amen."

Surely these touching words may well melt the heart of the hardest among us. Surely the remembrance of them, and of the deep bitterness of soul which poured them forth, may serve as a warning to deter us of the Clergy from sinning against our own consciences by solemnizing such marriages as these. Surely also, our brethren of the Laity, in their Christian mercy will spare us this sore trial; they will never consent to reduce twenty thousand men who are over them in the Lord, and have a sacred commission from Him, and are under His care and protection as His Ministers, to the painful necessity of either withholding the obedience which they must ever desire most earnestly to pay to the Laws of their country, or of sinning against their own consciences, and violating the Law of God, and of incurring the wrath of Christ by solemnizing such Marriages as He condemned as adulterous when He said, "Whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery."

Finally, let us remember that a great and solemn question is now before us. Our domestic peace, our national happi-

ness, depend on its right decision. May He, of His mercy, guide those aright in whose hands the decision is!

England is now on her trial in the sight of men, angels, and of God. The present crisis is fraught with results of unspeakable importance, either for weal or woe, to her and her children for many generations.

If we reject the Law of Christ, and follow our own devices, we shall plunge ourselves in an abyss of misery and shame.

But, on the other hand, if, by divine grace, we are true to God and ourselves, such emergencies as these may be made occasions of unspeakable good. Our present peril may be made the source of future blessings. It calls on us all to awake, it calls on us to reflect on the true nature, dignity, and sanctity of Marriage, and on the heinousness of sins committed against it; and on the wretched condition of those men and nations who give encouragements to Adultery by granting facilities to Divorce, and to the second marriages of adulterous persons, and defy the divine authority, and incur the terrific wrath of Him Who said, "Whosoever marrieth a divorced woman committeth adultery." It appeals to us with a voice from heaven to join with heart and hand as one man, and to pray with one accord to God for grace and power to maintain the blessings we possess in the safeguards which fence the Marriage union in this our favoured land. It appeals to us to defend that Union from all sacrilegious assaults, and from all unholy contaminations; to protect that sacred Institution which was ordained by God in Paradise, and which was restored and repaired, and invested with new beauty by Jesus Christ; and to win a crown of immortal glory at His Hand, when He, the Divine Bridegroom, will appear again on the clouds of heaven, and when He shall cast out all that is impure, and consign it to the Lake of Fire,[6] and will receive the faithful Bride within the golden portals of heaven, and will welcome the pure in heart to "sit down in the Kingdom of God," as guests at "the Marriage Supper of the Lamb."[7]

[6] Rev. xxi. 8.

[7] Luke xiii. 29. Rev. xix. 7, 9.

ON MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

The following is the substance of a Sermon preached by the Author in Westminster Abbey as Canon in residence in March, 1859; when this subject was before Parliament.

In the eighteenth chapter of the book Leviticus [1] Almighty God speaks as follows to the Israelites concerning the judgments which He was about to inflict by their hands upon the nations of Canaan: "Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it." In a few years afterwards He executed His purpose, and exterminated those nations by Joshua and his armies. He here declares the reason of that extermination: the land was defiled. And he warns the Israelites, that, if they defile themselves in any of the things in which those nations were defiled, they would be visited by Him with the same chastisements as He was about to inflict by them on the Canaanites.

It will be remembered, that among the sins there specified by God as the cause of this national extirpation, and which are recited in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus, the first place is assigned to unholy marriages; that is, to marriages contracted within the degrees of consanguinity and of affinity forbidden by His law: and that for those sins the names of those Nations were blotted out from under heaven.

But how, it may be asked, is this relevant to us?

The Divine law concerning Marriage contained in this chapter has been received among ourselves for many generations; it has been regarded by our forefathers, even from

[1] Lev. xviii. 24, 25.

primitive times, as binding upon Christians;[2] it has been embodied in our own laws, both civil and ecclesiastical.[3] But it is now proposed to abrogate one of the provisions which our ancestors believed to be contained in that Divine code. It is said that we ought to rescind the prohibition which restrains a man from contracting marriage with the sister of his wife, after his wife's death.

Here, then is a grave question for us: for if it be true, as our forefathers believed it to be, that the Marriage Code promulgated by God in this chapter is binding upon us; and if it be also true, as our ancestors deemed it to be, that the restriction just specified is comprehended in that Code, then we have reason to fear, that if this restriction be removed, other infractions of the same Code would soon follow,[4] to the confusion of domestic relations and the destruction of domestic peace. And even if this were not the result, yet since God has declared that they who wilfully break one of His laws are held by Him to be guilty of the breach of all,[5] and it is expressly said in this chapter, that "Whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even

[2] See the statements from Church Councils, and Ancient Fathers, collected by two learned Lutherans, *Chemnitius*, Loci Theologici de Matrimonio, p. 212, and *Gerhard*, Loci Theologici de Conjugio, vol. vii. p. 281.

[3] See Bp. Gibson, Codex Juris Ecc. Anglicani, tit. xxii. cap. i. p. 412. Burn's Eccl. Law, Art. Marriage, vol. i. pp. 723—734, ed. Phillimore. Canons of 1603, Can. 99, where it is said, "No persons shall marry within the degrees prohibited by the Laws of God, and expressed in a Table set forth by authority in the year of our Lord God, 1563; and all marriages so made and contracted shall be adjudged incestuous and unlawful, and consequently shall be dissolved as void from the beginning, and the parties so married shall by course of law be separated. And the aforesaid Table shall be in every church publicly set up and fixed at the charge of the parish." Cp. Hammond's Works, i. p. 590, ed. Lond. 1864. And the valuable work, by an American jurist, Hugh Davey Evans, on the Christian Law of Marriage, chap. xiv. especially § 25 (New York, 1870), and Lord Hatherley's Speech, 1850.

[4] Indeed, one of the Bills (1849) for legalizing a marriage with a *wife's sister* contained also a provision for marriage with a *niece* of a deceased wife; and it has been avowed by some who support the measure that if the marriage of a *husband* with a *deceased wife's sister* be legalized, the marriage of a *wife* with a *deceased husband's brother* cannot be any longer prohibited.

[5] James ii. 10, 11.

the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people;"[6] we may therefore expect that the same Divine judgments which were inflicted on the nations of Canaan may overtake us; or rather, that we may be chastised with even greater severity than they were, because we have not been deterred from their sins by their punishment, which is set before us by God as our warning in His Holy Word. Let us, therefore, address ourselves to the consideration of this subject with that prayer for illumination, and with that calm earnestness which its importance demands.

1. The first question which arises is:—

Does the Divine Code in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus concern us?

To this we may reply, that it is binding upon us, and upon all men in every age.

For, observe, it is said that of all the sins forbidden in this code, the nations of Canaan were guilty.[7]

Now, it is clearly stated in Holy Scripture, that "Where no law is, there is no transgression,"[8] and, that "sin is not imputed where there is no law,"[9] for the essence of sin is, that it is the transgression of law.[1]

Since, then, the Canaanites were guilty of the sins recited in this chapter, they must have been under the law by which those sins are forbidden.

Therefore *that* law is *not* a part of the civil Law given to the *Jews, as such,* but it appertains to the common Law binding on all nations. It is antecedent to the Levitical Law. Indeed, as the Jews themselves allow, it is at least as old as the flood;[2] and therefore the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus does *not* contain any *enactment* of a *new* code, obligatory on the Jews only, but it is declaratory of laws *already* in force and binding on all *nations.*

It therefore concerns us; and if we violate its statutes, we

[6] Lev. xviii. 29. [7] Lev. xviii. 24—28. [8] Rom. iv. 15.
[9] Rom. v. 13. [1] 1 John iii. 4.

[2] See the Jewish Authorities cited by Hooker, IV. xi. 3, where he says that "Marriage within a number of degrees was not only by the law of Moses, but also by the law of the sons of *Noah, unlawful;* and also Hammond, i. pp. 587, 588, and the authorities in Poli Synopsis on Lev. xviii. 16; and Selden, de Jure Naturali, v. 11.

may expect to suffer the penalties which are denounced by God on those who transgress it.

2. The next question is—

Were our forefathers right when they said that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is forbidden by that law? Is any such prohibition contained in that Code or not?

Here, again, I reply in the affirmative.

But where, you may ask, is the prohibition? You look through the chapter in question, and you do not find any *express recital* of such a restriction.

What shall we say here?

The Bible is the Word of God; and man's Reason is the gift of God. The *true sense* of the *Bible* is *the Bible;* and the Bible is given to us as *reasonable* men, and we are bound to use our reason in ascertaining its true sense. And whatever can be shown by sound reason to be contained in the Bible, is the true sense of the Bible; it is an integral part of the Bible; and they who reject what can be thus proved by logical inference to be the true sense of the Bible, do in fact take away from the Bible, and they incur the punishment which God has declared that He will inflict on those who mutilate His Word.[3]

To ask for an express text for everything we do, or forbear to do, is to tempt God, and to disparage His Word as imperfect, and to despise the gift of Reason which we have from Him.

But if we prize our Bibles and our Reason, we shall follow the Apostle's precept "to compare spiritual things with spiritual,"[4] and by a careful collation of the several parts of Scripture endeavour to elicit the true meaning of the whole.[5]

Accordingly we find that our blessed Lord Himself charges those with *ignorance of Scripture* who did not act thus.[6] When He reasoned with the Sadducees on the doctrine of

[3] Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32.

[4] 1 Cor. ii. 13.

[5] Hence, therefore, it is well said in the Articles of the Church of England (Art. vi.), that nothing is to be required of any man as necessary to salvation which is not "read therein, nor may be *proved thereby.*"

[6] Matt. xxii. 29. Mark xii. 24.

the Resurrection, He did *not* quote to them any text where that doctrine is recited in *express words*, but He referred them to a passage from which that doctrine was to be *deduced*, by a sound *logical inference*: "As touching the dead, that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, I am the God of Abraham? . . . He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; ye therefore do greatly err."[7]

So again, in confuting the Pharisees on the subject of Divorce *for every cause*, He did not appeal to any text where divorce is expressly forbidden, but He charged them with ignorance and error, because they had failed to *infer* God's will on that subject from His own Word: "*Have ye not read*, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female? For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh. What *therefore* God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."[8]

Besides, if no restrictions are to be admitted which are deduced by sound logical inference, but *only such* as are recited in *express terms*, then a man might even *marry his own daughter*; for there is *no express prohibition* of such a marriage in the Divine Code.

3. Here, therefore, the question occurs, Can it be proved by *sound logical inference* that the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister is *contained* in the Law of God?

Yes, surely it can. For consider this. We read in Holy Scripture that woman was made out of man, and that man said, "This is now bone of my bones, and *flesh of my flesh*;" and it is added, "Therefore shall a man cleave unto his wife, and *they shall be one flesh*."[9]

Remember also that this declaration has been adopted and re-enforced by Christ Himself in the Gospel.

Therefore, your wife's sister is *your* sister; and as a man

[7] Mark xii. 26, 27.

[8] Matt. xix. 4—6.

[9] Gen. ii. 22—24; cp. Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 7; Eph. v. 31. The expression is still stronger in the original Hebrew (*le basar echad*), and in the Gospels in the *accusative case*, εἰς σάρκα μίαν; that is, joined together *into one flesh*: "so then they are no more twain, but one flesh." Mark x. 8.

may not marry his own sister after his wife's death, so neither may he marry his wife's sister.[1]

4. Indeed, this is evident from the Law of God.

In the chapter now before us, a man is forbidden to marry the mother of his deceased wife, and he is forbidden to marry the daughter of his wife, or the daughter of her son, or of her daughter. And why? Because it is declared, they are near of kin to her, or, as the original expresses it, they are *part of her flesh*.[2] And such marriages are described as *wickedness*. For they who are joined to him in such marriages are *part* of the *flesh* of *her* who had been made *one flesh* with him by marriage. And if *they* are part of her flesh, surely her *sister* also is part of her flesh. Indeed, this point has been settled in this same chapter, where it is expressly affirmed that a man may not marry the *sister* of his father. And why? Because (it is added) the sister is the near kinswoman of his father:[3] or, as the original expresses it, is *part* of the *flesh* of his father.[4] Hence, it is clear that a man may not marry his wife's sister, because his wife's sister is part of the flesh of her who, as God declares in both Testaments, was made by marriage to be *one flesh* with him.[5] It is remarkable that the connexion especially

[1] This was the argument of the Caræans or Scripturists, among the Jews, who censured such a marriage as unlawful. See *Selden*, Uxor Hebr. i. 3; Opera, vol. iii. pp. 539—542, ed. Lond. 1726.

[2] *Shaarah*, Lev. xviii. 17; cp. xx. 14, where Drusius and Munster observe that *shëer* has nearly the same meaning as *basar, flesh*, and so Gesenius, Lexicon, p. 799. See also v. 6, where it is expressly said, that none shall approach near to any that are *part of his flesh;* rendered in our version *near of kin*.

[3] Lev. xviii. 12.

[4] *Shëer*.

[5] This argument has been well stated by the Rev. W. Abner Brown, in his tract on the subject, p. 9, 2nd edit.: "Let us examine the Scripture rule. It forbids a man to marry 'any that is *near of kin to him;*' and mentions in the following order thirteen instances of persons directly or indirectly near of kin, viz. his mother, his *stepmother or father's wife*, his sister, his half-sister, his own grand-daughter, his father's sister, his mother's sister, his *aunt or father's brother's wife*, his own *daughter-in-law or son's wife*, his *sister-in-law or brother's wife*, his *wife's mother*, his *wife's daughter*, his *wife's grand-daughter*. Six of these women are blood relations, Seven (printed in italics) are persons made relations by

condemned as *incestuous* in the New Testament is not one of *consanguinity*, but of *affinity*.[6]

5. Remember also this. A man may not marry his brother's widow; or in other words, a woman is forbidden to marry her *deceased husband's brother*. This prohibition is repeated twice in Scripture.[7] And the reason is, that the wife of the brother is one flesh with him.[8]

Now, surely, thy wife's sister is as near to thee as thy brother is to thy wife; and since thy wife is forbidden to marry thy brother after thy death, so art thou forbidden to marry her sister after her death. God has forbidden the former of these marriages as execrable, and can He reasonably be supposed to approve the latter? Surely this cannot be.[9]

marriage only. The whole follow the words 'near of kin' without break or distinction; except that after the charge not to marry his wife's relations there is added, 'for they are her near kinswomen; it is wickedness.' This last word is the translation of the Hebrew word used for the vilest kind of lewdness, in Judges xx. 6; Ezek. xvi. 43, and xxii. 11.

[6] 1 Cor. v. 1.

[7] Lev. xviii. 16; xx. 21.

[8] "*Fratris nuditas est*, id est *una caro cum fratre*."—Hammond, see in Poli Synops. *ad loc.* Lev. xviii. 16.

[9] This is thus stated by Bishop Jewel, in a letter in Strype's Parker, Appendix, book ii. No. xix.:—

"You must remember that certain degrees are there left out untouched (in Leviticus xviii.), within which nevertheless it was never thought lawful for men to marry. For example, there is nothing provided there by express words but that a man may marry his own grandmother, or his grandfather's second wife, or the wife of his unkle by his mother's side; no, nor is there any express prohibition in al this chapter but that a man *may mary his own daughter;* yet will no man say, that any of these degrees may join together in lawful mariage. Wherefore we must needs think, that God in that chapter hath especially and namely forbidden certain degrees; not as leaving al mariage lawful which He had not there expresly forbidden, but that thereby, as by infallible precedents, we might be able to rule the rest. As, when God saith, No man shall mary his *mother*, is contained both the grandmother and the grandfather's wife, and that such mariage is forbidden. Thus you see, God himself would have us to expound one degree by another. So likewise in this case, albeit I be not forbidden by *plain words to mary my wives sister*, yet am I forbidden so to do *by other words which by exposition are plain enough.* For, when God commands me I shal not *mary my brother's wife*, it follows directly by the same, that he forbids me to *mary my wife's sister.*

6. But here it has been alleged by some, that since in a certain case Almighty God commanded that a wife should be joined in marriage to a deceased husband's brother, namely, in case that her husband had died without issue;[1] and since God cannot be supposed to command anything *immoral*, therefore the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister cannot be immoral.

Is then God inconsistent with Himself? In His Holy Word He has forbidden a woman to be joined in marriage to her husband's brother. But in a special case, for a special reason, applicable only to the Jews, God was pleased to *dispense* with His own law; and in the plenitude of His Divine omnipotence, and for the purpose, it may be, of showing His Divine Sovereignty, to change the prohibition into a command.[2]

But because God, Who is the Supreme Lord of all, and Who is the Fountain of Law, was pleased in a particular case to dispense with His own law, shall we—His creatures, who are subject to that law—dare to suppose that we can seat ourselves on God's throne, and dispense with that law? No, surely; for, as St. James speaks, God is the *one Law-giver*, "Who is able to save and to destroy."[3] God cannot command anything that is sinful. For *sin* is the *transgression of His law*;[4] and whatever He commands is right. But it is no less absurd and presumptuous to say, that *we* may dispense with God's law concerning marriage, because *He*

For between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers, is like *analogy* or proportion, which is my judgment in this case. And other such like ought to be taken for a rule."

So Hammond, i. p. 583: "And just thus it is in this matter: this of the wife's sister which is not named, being directly the same degree of propinquity, as that of the brother's wife, which He named and prohibited. And that will appear by either of the two ways of measuring the propinquity, the wife's sister being as near to the husband as the husband's brother is to the wife, and the sister's husband as near to the other sister as the brother's wife can be to the brother. And accordingly, the Scripturarian Jews, as well as the rest, do here resolve, That a man is forbidden to marry two which are kin to one another, and specifie in a woman and her sister."

[1] Deut. xxv. 5. Mark xii. 20—22.
[2] Lev. xx. 21.
[3] James iv. 12.
[4] 1 John iii. 4.

in one case dispensed with it, than it would be to affirm that murder is not immoral, because God, Who is the sole Arbiter of life and death, commanded Abraham to slay his son Isaac;[5] or that we may innocently commit theft, because God, Who is the Lord of all the earth, commanded the Israelites to spoil the Canaanites, and to take their cities into possession.[6]

7. Again, it has been affirmed by some, that in the chapter now before us God has given a man permission to marry his wife's sister *after her death.*

This assertion requires careful consideration.

The permission in question, it is alleged, may be deduced by logical inference from the eighteenth verse of this eighteenth chapter of Leviticus.

There we read as follows: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her . . . beside the other in her lifetime."

Here, then, the question is asked, When God forbids a man to marry his wife's sister *during* his *wife's life*, may it not be fairly inferred, that He does *not forbid* him to marry her *after* his wife's *death?*

To this we would answer, No; such an inference is not sound.

For, first, suppose, for argument's sake, that the English words just recited are a correct translation of the Hebrew original, then we affirm, that in all interpretations of law the general drift of the whole must be considered, and be used as the clue for its exposition; and that in right constructions of law, that which is doubtful is to be elucidated by means of what is clear, and not that which is clear be obscured by that which is doubtful. And we assert that such an inference as has just been recited is at variance with the whole context of the law, by which a man is expressly forbidden to contract marriage with the *kindred* of his wife, as has been already shown, in which a *sister* is specially mentioned as near of kin.[7]

[5] Gen. xxii. 2. [6] Exod. iii. 22; xii. 36.

[7] And so Bp. Patrick and a large body of commentators, who rightly

The fact is, as has been well observed by one of our wisest divines, that it is altogether inconsistent with a right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures to imagine that "a thing *denied* with special circumstances doth import an *opposite affirmation* when that circumstance is expired."[8]

For example: when Samuel had uttered a stern prophecy against Saul, we read that he came no more to see him *until the day of his death*.[9] But are we therefore to infer from this text, that Samuel came to see Saul *after* his death. Again, we read that Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child *until* the day of *her death*.[1] Was she then a mother in the grave? Christ promised to be with the Apostles *until the end of the world*.[2] Will He begin to be absent from them then? No; He will then come in His glorified body, and they *will be for ever with the Lord*.[3]

If, then, our English translation represents rightly here the words of the original, the meaning of this verse is, that though a man's wife may become aged, infirm, or ungracious, and though her sister may be more fair and attractive in person and disposition, yet he may not espouse the sister in addition to the wife, *however long the wife may live*. And this prohibition may have been occasioned by the case of the patriarch Jacob, who, under extenuating circumstances,[4] married Rachel, the sister of Leah his wife, in her lifetime; and whose example, by reason of his patriarchal dignity, might perhaps be construed into a dangerous precedent.[5]

But this prohibition is not to be drawn into a permission to marry a wife's sister *after her* death—a marriage which had been excluded by previous enactments in the same code, forbidding marriages with a wife's kindred, and specifying a sister as *near of kin*.

8. But, after all, it is very doubtful whether this verse,

affirm that on such grounds as these marriage with a wife's sister is unlawful.

[8] Hooker, V. xlv. 2, with reference to the memorable text, Matt. i. 25

[9] 1 Sam. xv. 35. [1] 2 Sam. vi. 23.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 20. Cp. Bp. Pearson on the Creed, Art. iii. p. 174, "Born of the Virgin Mary."

[3] 1 Thess. v. 17. [4] Gen. xxix. 25—28.

[5] So Gerhard, de Conjugio, § 350; and others.

the eighteenth, which has been pleaded in favour of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, has any connexion with the question at issue.

It is very probable that the true rendering of this verse is that which our translators have placed in the *margin* of our Bibles; and that the real sense of the passage is, "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another," to vex her, *beside the other*, in her lifetime.

In a word, this verse has, probably, nothing to do with the marriage of a *wife's sister*, but is a prohibition against the marriage of *more wives than one* at a time.

Why, it may be asked, do we affirm this ? First, we reply, look at the scope of the code. It forbids marriage with a wife's kindred after her death. It specifies a sister as near of kin. Was it necessary to forbid marriage with a wife's sister ? Surely not.

Next remark, that the reason given against a man's taking a second wife in his wife's lifetime is, lest by so doing he *vex her*. But this is no special argument against marrying her *sister :* she would be as much vexed, whether that second wife were *any other woman*, as she would be if she were her *sister*.

Next observe the place of this verse. It stands at the end of the prohibitions concerning affinity, and at the head of a series of *general* prohibitions, which have no reference to affinity. It may therefore belong to the latter, and not to the former.

And next, look at the words of the original. The Hebrew phrase is *ishah el achothah ;* and this is rightly rendered in our margins [6] *one wife to another ;* or *one woman to another ; not* one wife to her *sister*.

For, if you look through the books of Moses, you will find this Hebrew phrase used to describe the coupling of one thing with another.[7]

[6] It stands there in the original edition of our Authorized Version, A.D. 1611.

[7] See Pagnini Lex. Hebr. p. 83, where he says that it is carefully to be noted, as Rabbi David observes, that in Hebrew anything is called *ish* (man), or *ishah* (woman), as the faces of the Cherubim in Exod. xxv. 20,

Thus in the twenty-sixth chapter of Exodus it occurs four times,[8] and in none of these does it signify a *wife* to *her sister,* but simply a *thing* to *its fellow.* And so it is used in other places of Holy Writ. And in like manner the Hebrew phrase which signifies literally "a man to his *brother,*" does not mean, "a man to his brother by *blood,*" but simply, "one man to his fellow," or "one man to another man;" and so it is commonly rendered in our Bibles.[9]

Therefore we may conclude, that this phrase in question is well translated in our margin, "*one* wife *to another,*" and accordingly it has been understood in this sense by many of the best Hebrew scholars, both Jewish[1] and

where the original literally means "*one man to his brother.*" Cp. Exod. xxxvii, 9. And so the curtains in Exod. xxvi. 3 are said to be coupled "*one woman to her sister,*" that is, *one* curtain *to another.* See also Gesenius' Hebrew Lex., pp. xxvii, xxx, ed. London, 1847. Cp. Gen. xiii. 11; xxvi. 31. Exod. xvi. 15; xxxii. 27—29. Isa. iii. 5; xix. 2. Ezek. i. 19; iii. 13; xvi. 45, 48, 49. Joel ii. 8.

[8] Verses 3, 5, 6, 17.

[9] The following important statement on this point is from the Rev. Charles Forster's remarks on this question; London, 1850, p. 32: "This phrase, 'a woman to her sister,' together with the similar formula in the masculine, viz. 'a man to his brother,' occur, with slight variations of the intervening preposition or conjunction, *two-and-forty* times in the Hebrew Bible, and *never once* does it designate the blood relationship of *two sisters or* two brothers, but always and invariably means (when used of persons) simply *two men together,* or *two women together;* and when used of things (for it is used of things as well as of persons) it means two masculine or feminine things of *the same kind.* And it is actually thus translated in our Bible in thirty-two out of the forty-one other places where it occurs; and in the other nine places *brother* obviously does not refer to consanguinity, but to proximity. If, therefore, this expression designates in Lev. xviii. 18 the blood relationship of two sisters, I can only say that this *is the solitary instance in the whole Bible where it has such a meaning.*

"Out of two-and-forty times, then, in which this Hebrew idiom occurs, it is agreed on all hands that in forty-one instances it has no reference to the blood relationship of two brothers or two sisters, but simply means two persons or things of the same kind." See also the analysis of the passages in Dwight's "Hebrew Wife," pp. 84—91.

[1] E. g. Junius, Tremellius, and Hammond, i. p. 584. See also Drusius in Critici Sacri in loc. i. pt. ii. p. 291; and so Calovius, Ainsworth, Beza, and Willet. And see also the Annotations of the Westminster Divines, 1651; and so Schleusner, Lexic. V. T. ἀδελφή. See also Archdeacon

Christian.[2] Thus everything in the context becomes clear and consistent. You may not take *any other woman*, whether sister or no, *to wife*, so long as your *wife lives*.

9. Here however it has been asked by some, if this is a prohibition against polygamy, how is it that many of the ancient Hebrews were polygamists? How is it that Solomon, and even David, had more wives than one? Would this have been the case if there had been a law of God against plurality of wives?

The answer is, the practice of man is not a sure interpreter of the law of God. "Let God be true, and every man a liar."[3] You say, some of the kings were polygamists, and therefore God had not forbidden polygamy. But no; what says God's law? The king shall *not multiply wives to himself*.[4] Is not this a prohibition of polygamy? And certainly the words of the Old Testament which were quoted by our Lord as forbidding *divorce*, are as clearly prohibitory of polygamy. A man shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.[5]

10. And here we have a ready answer to another objection.

It is said by some, that the Jews to whom the Sacred Oracles were given,[6] approve the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister, and that we Christians ought to follow them in their interpretation of those Oracles.

But this inference is erroneous.

For, first, those Jews who allow these marriages do not allow them after the divorce of the wife, as long as she is living, and thus witness to their illegality.

Next, the disparaging terms in which these other Jewish rabbis speak of the Sacred Oracles in comparison with their own traditions, will deter every pious reader of Scripture

Hessey's excellent pamphlet on this subject; third edition, 1855, pp. 12, 19.

[2] By the Karaite Jews, generally, i. e. by those Jews who rightly prefer the *letter* of *God's Word* to the traditions of men and the Rabbinical glosses of the Talmud.

[3] Rom. iii. 4.

[4] Deut. xvii. 17.

[5] Matt. xix. 5.

[6] The Karaite Jews, See Selden, Uxor Hebraica, i. 3—6.

from placing confidence in their expositions. They say[7] that the *written text* of Scripture, as contrasted with their traditions, is only as water compared with wine, and that the words of the scribes are lovelier than those of the law, and that the precepts of the rabbis are weightier than those of the prophets; and their predecessors were condemned by Christ as making the law of God of none effect by their traditions.[8] Shall we then follow such leaders as these? Does not St. Paul say that the veil is on the hearts of the Jews in reading the Old Testament,[9] and that they know not the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath Day?[1]

If the Jewish expositors of Scripture are to be followed, then we must cease to be followers of Christ; then Christ is not come; then we shall be followers of those who say that Jesus of Nazareth was justly crucified.

But let us not prefer the broken cisterns of the Talmud to the living waters of Holy Scripture. If we do, then we may come with the Jewish doctors to Christ, and ask, Is it lawful *to put away a wife for every cause?*[2] and then we may also be denounced by the Divine Teacher as an *adulterous and sinful generation.*[3] We, too, may be addressed as the inhabitants of Jerusalem were by the Apostle, a little before its destruction, *Ye adulterers and adulteresses,*[4] when they also, as the Canaanites of old, were about to be exterminated for their sins.

11. Let us rather turn to the Christian Sion, the spiritual Jerusalem, the Church of the Living God, to which Christ has promised His presence and the guidance of the Holy Ghost.[5] How, let us ask, has the Church of Christ interpreted the Law of God in this matter? If marriage with a wife's sister was lawful—if our Christian forefathers had deemed it to be lawful—many such marriages would have

[7] See numerous Rabbinical authorities to this effect in Prideaux, Connexion; part i. chap. v. on B.C. 447.

[8] Mark vii. 15.

[1] Acts xiii. 27.

[3] Matt. xii. 20; xvi. 4.

[5] Matt. xx. John xiv. 16.

[9] 2 Cor. iii. 14.

[2] Matt. xix. 3.

[4] James iv. 4.

taken place. We are told that *many* such marriages *now* take place, and *therefore,* it is pleaded, they ought to be *made* lawful. But look back to the past, to the time of Christ and of the Apostles. *Not a single testimony in favour* of such marriages can be cited from any Christian writer of any note, for *fourteen centuries after Christ.* All Christendom abhorred them. Remember the words of the holy Bishop of Cæsarea,[6] St. Basil, deservedly called the Great, who, writing in the fourth century, speaks not only in his own name, but bears testimony to the judgment of his predecessors on this subject, and says, "Our custom in this matter has the force of law, because the statutes we observe have been handed down to us by holy men; and our judgment is this, that if a man has fallen into the sin of marrying two sisters, we do *not regard such an union as marriage,* nor do we receive the parties to communion with the Church until they are separated."

Such is the testimony of Christian Antiquity; and such is the judgment of the Eastern Church to this day.[7]

12. If now it be said that the Church of Rome allows such marriages, and that we ought to do the same, first, we deny the fact; for she does not solemnize them *without a dispensation,* and thus is still a witness to their illegality. But having, alas! been tempted by the lust of lucre and of power, to swerve from the rule of her fathers,[8] and to grant such dispensations, which she did first in the sixteenth century,[9] her eyes are blinded, and she cannot see, what formerly she saw clearly, that these marriages are forbidden by God's Word, lest haply she be forced to allow that she

[6] "Basilium totus veneratur Antiquitatis chorus; plaudit tota eruditorum cavea." Cave, Hist. Lat. i. p. 219.

[7] See Rev. W. Palmer's Statement, pp. 58—69, London, 1849.

[8] It is remarkable that the very ancient Vatican Manuscript of the Septuagint (lately published by Cardinal Mai), contains a curse against those who lie with their wife's sister, in Deut. xxvii. 23. This was probably at first only a *marginal* note, and has passed from the margin into the text; but it is an important witness of the opinion of the early age in which that MS. was written.

[9] The first dispensation of this kind was given A.D. 1500, by Pope Alexander VI. (Borgia), to Emmanuel, King of Portugal. In the next generation the King's family was extinct.

has been guilty of the heinous sin of dispensing with God's Law.

And shall we follow her in this?

If it should be urged that some Protestant communions do not censure these marriages, which we for our part are loth to believe, our only reply need be, that all their pious predecessors condemned[1] those marriages; and if some of our Protestant brethren have now fallen away from the faith and practice of their forefathers, whose names they hold in reverence, we humbly hope they will not censure us for proving our reverence for their forefathers by vindicating their wisdom, and by following their example.

13. But we are told that many persons have contracted these marriages, and that their consciences ought to be relieved, and their embarrassments removed, by the repeal of the law. To this we reply, Is the hedge to be rooted up, because some make a gap in it? Is the wall to be broken down, because some overleap it? This would be an encouragement to crime. Let murders and thefts and adulteries only become numerous enough, and on such a plea we may be required to abrogate the Decalogue. Men's sins ought not to be pleaded as a reason for defying God's power, and rescinding God's law, and for bringing down His judgments upon us.[2]

Let us here offer a few words to those who have contracted these marriages.

Let it not be supposed that we do not sympathize with them. We feel for them deeply. We know that many women have been entangled in these marriages by representations that they are not forbidden by the Divine law, and also by allegations that if they contract these marriages

[1] So Beza, Melancthon, Luther, and Chemnitz. See Gerhard, Loci Theologici de Conjugio, sec. 347, vol. vii. p. 374, the Westminster Divines, M. Henry, and Dr. C. J. Brown, of Edinburgh. The judgment of our Reformers is clear from the "Table of Degrees" set forth by them, and from Reformatio Legum, fol. 23, where it is said that marriage with a deceased wife's sister *communi doctorum virorum consensu putatur in Levitico prohiberi.*

[2] See the remarks in Archdeacon Randall's charge for 1858, pp. 16—21; and Dwight's "Hebrew Wife," edited by Dr. Wardlaw, Glasgow, 1837.

in some foreign land where they are not prohibited by human law, they become valid marriages in England—which is a great mistake. This being so, we readily allow that they are worthy objects of tender compassion. We mourn over them. But true sympathy is shown, not by flattery, but by speaking the truth in love. Their marriage is contrary to God's law, and therefore is sinful, for sin is the breach of God's law.[3] Their only remedy therefore is in repentance. "Except ye repent," says our Lord, "ye shall perish."[4] Let them therefore not harden their hearts against Him, and so provoke His wrath and incur everlasting misery; but let them confess their sin to Him, and pray to Him for pardon for His dear Son's sake, Who can wash them clean from sin; and for the grace of the Holy Spirit, that they may walk before Him in newness of life. On their death-bed, at the day of judgment, they will thank us for these words. What is to be done in any particular case depends much on its circumstances; the advice should be sought of a holy, wise, and learned spiritual guide, who would give counsel and comfort to the penitent.

Yet, further, Christian charity is a large and comprehensive virtue. It has sympathies not only for those who *break* the law, and who desire it to be *repealed*, but for those who *obey* the law, and wish it to be *maintained*. In our compassion for the former, let us not forget the latter; let us not betray the rights and impair the happiness of husbands who love their wives' sisters as their own sisters, and admit them to the nearest and dearest intercourse of fraternal affection. And let us not inflict an injury on those sisters of a wife, who are now received into the most confidential and endearing intercourse in the home of their sister's husband. All those tender relationships, which impart an inexpressible charm and delicate sanctity to our English homes, would be scattered to the winds by the repeal of the law of God, which requires a husband to regard his wife's sisters as his own sisters, and to honour and love them as such.

Such blessings as these are beyond all price. If you

[3] John iii. 4.

[4] Luke xiii. 3.

marry a wife, and your wife has a sister, you are received at once to a near and dear friendship with her. Her sister is your sister: you love her as a sister, and she loves you as a brother. You have gained a sister by marrying a wife; and they also have gained, the one a husband and the other a brother, without losing a sister. Thus your marriage is doubly blessed, to you and to them. In your wife's sister you have one with whom you may take sweet counsel in time of joy and of sorrow: she will rejoice in your joys, and sorrow in your sorrows. She will be like an angel of light, and love, in the days of sickness and of sorrow, to yourself, your wife, and your children. She may be admitted without suspicion to the privacy of the sick-chamber and of the death-bed. She will mingle her tears with yours, and be to you a sister indeed—a sister in Jesus Christ.

14. But, let this law be repealed, and all these blessings are gone—gone for ever. The morrow after its repeal, the sisters of all the wives in England, and the wives who have sisters, and the husbands of such wives, and the children of such husbands and wives, will find their position changed. The husband will have lost the sister whom he had gained by marriage. The wife will have lost the sister whom she had by blood. The wife's sister will have ceased to be a sister, and have become almost a stranger. She can no longer enter the house with the same freedom and familiarity as before. Or, if she does, what jealousies and heart-burnings may arise! The wife may be less fair than her sister, she may be growing old and infirm, her sister may be young and beautiful; then comes the Tempter and whispers in the ear of frail and fallen man that Divorce has now become easy in England; and we may follow the Jews and those other nations[5] whose example is here so earnestly commended to us by some for our imitation, and make Divorce easier still; and then, fatal result! conjugal

[5] Who consider "incompatibility of temper" as a sufficient ground for divorce. Already a woman *divorced* "a vinculo" is regarded by English law as *dead*, and her husband may marry another. If marriage with a *deceased* wife's sister is legalized, then marriage with a *divorced* wife's sister will soon be lawful also.

estrangement may ensue, and a separation may take place, and the wife's sister may supplant the wife, and may be set up in her sister's house, at her sister's table, and in her sister's place, and the wife's children may loathe their own home, and may hate their mother's sister, and their own father, as the authors of their mother's misery and of their mother's disgrace.

15. Nor let us forget the sacred rights of those who minister in our churches and at our altars. What is the faithful Parish Priest to do, if a man or a woman who has contracted one of these marriages present himself or herself at the Lord's Table? Can he administer to them those holy mysteries? Would he too not be a traitor to God and His Church, whose law is clear on this point, if he ventured to do so? And if the Civil Power should legalize such a marriage by its authority, would he not be charged with disloyalty to his Sovereign, and to the Government of his country, if he refused to do so? He would be placed in a painful dilemma; but his course is plain. He must obey God rather than men.[6] But it will be an evil day for England when the Civil Power engages in a conflict with the Church of God, and proclaims war against the Ministers of God.

16. If there be any who desire to contract such marriages as these, or to rescind the law which forbids them, let them be exhorted to pause before they proceed further.

If, as our forefathers believed, these marriages are unlawful; if, as all Christendom testified for fourteen centuries after Christ, they are forbidden by God's Word, let us not begin a course of which we cannot see the end. If we tamper with His Law in one point, we may soon be led on to violate the whole. Then He will fight against us. The vials of His wrath and indignation, which were discharged on the nations of Canaan, will be poured on our heads.

Rather, let us make fresh endeavours to vindicate the purity of marriage, and to defend its sanctity.

Marriage was instituted by God, in order to diffuse the blessings of society, and to colonize the world. Let us

[6] Acts iv. 19; v. 29.

not allow its healthful streams to be pent up and putrify in the sterile and stagnant pools of consanguinity and affinity; but let them flow far and wide, in free and fruitful freshness, to evangelize the earth, and to people heaven.

Then we may cherish the hope, that when He, Who is the Divine Bridegroom, and Who has espoused our Nature, and has joined it for ever to the Nature of God, and Who beautified Marriage, and has consecrated it to such an excellent mystery that in it is represented and signified the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Himself and the Church,[7] shall appear again in glory, to receive to Himself the Bride, whom He loves and cherishes as *His own flesh*,[8] we may be invited to sit down at the marriage feast of the Lamb in heaven, and to taste that unalloyed and everlasting bliss which is promised to the *pure in heart*,[9] who "will see God."

[7] Eph. vii. 27—33. [8] Eph. v. 29. [9] Matt. v. 8.

ON ENFORCED CLERICAL CELIBACY.

A FEW days before I left England for Cologne in 1872 (see above, vol. i. p. 439), I received a letter from a distinguished Roman Catholic Ecclesiastic (then staying in London) well known, under the name of Père Hyacinthe, for his eloquent *Conférences* at Nôtre Dame, Paris, and for his recently published volume, *De la Réforme Catholique*. In that letter he forwarded to me a copy of a communication, which he had addressed to the President of the Congress of the Old Catholics at Cologne.

He had in the first instance received an invitation to the Congress; but afterwards it was intimated to him that his presence would not be acceptable to some members of it, on account of his Marriage.

As that letter from this eminent French Preacher, and its enclosure, involved a grave public question of Ecclesiastical reform,—namely, as to *enforced Clerical Celibacy*,—and appeared to have an important bearing on the practice of the English Church, and the character of the English Clergy, especially of married English Priests and Bishops, attending the Congress, I felt it to require some notice on my part, and accordingly, while on my journey through Belgium, I addressed the following letter from Bruges to the President of the Cologne Congress:—

I did not enter into the circumstances of any particular case, but limited myself to the general question.

Viro spectatissimo, Congressûs Coloniensis Veterum Catholicorum Præsidi S. P. D., Christophorus Wordsworth, Episcopus Lincolniensis.

LITTERAS accepi a Viro Reverendo, Hyacintho Loyson, scrip-

tas, in quibus me de matrimonio suo Londini celebrato, quippe apud suos vetito, certiorem facit; et in quibus apographum mecum communicat Epistolæ ad Te datæ, in quâ quæstionem proponit, solenni Veterum Catholicorum Coloniæ congregandorum suffragio dijudicandam, utrum se, ad Congressum Vestrum invitatum, et magnoperè cupientem ei interesse, Vos benevolè sitis accepturi, an, propter matrimonium a se contractum, tanquam ob facinus admissum Sacerdote Catholico indignum, a cœtu vestro sitis exclusuri?

Huic tam gravi quæstioni memet immiscere noluissem, ne alienæ messi falcem immittere viderer, nisi Vir ille integerrimus et ornatissimus me tanquam causæ suæ patronum, utcunque indignum, advocâsset, et ne amico meo, invidorum hominum calumniis et opprobriis lacessito, deesse existimarer.

Accessit insuper alia res non levis momenti, propter quam ad Te, Vir eruditissime, litteras dare, quamvis raptim in itinere faciendo chartæ illitas, in animum induxerim. Nos Episcopi et Presbyteri Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ cœlibatum a Sacerdote Christiano propter majorem Dei gloriam et animorum salutem sponte susceptum honore et reverentiâ prosequimur: sed omnibus Christi Ministris præscribi debere tanquam rem necessariam prorsus negamus; imò Matrimonium sanctum Sacerdoti Christiano non tantum consolationem et adminiculum vitæ spiritualis, sed efficacissimum ad ædificationem populi Christiani adjumentum esse arbitramur.

Hæc igitur res, vestris suffragiis definienda, nos quoque tangit; et ab illâ alia pendere videtur quæstio, nempe utrum nos, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Episcopos et Presbyteros, de Matrimonio Sacerdotali ita sentientes, Vos tanquam vere *Veteres Catholicos* sitis agnituri?

Præclarè factum est, Vir egregie, ut apud vos, Germaniæ lectissimos viros, hæc quæstio sit dirimenda. Nam ut ingenii, constantiæ, et eruditionis dotes taceam, quæ vos ad rectè de hac re judicandum idoneos arbitros efficiant, neminem ferè latet, Germaniam Sacerdotii Christiani jura et privilegia in hâc potissimùm re strenuè et viriliter vindicasse. Cui non notæ sunt Valdrici vestri, Episcopi Augustani, sanctissimi viri, contra Pontificem Romanum Nicolaum Primum in

nono post Christum natum sæculo pro libertate clericorum conjugatorum dimicantis fortissimæ et invictissimæ protestationes? Et post miserrimam illam servitutem, a Gregorio Septimo, Hildebrando, Sacerdotibus Christianis matrimonium interdicentis impositam, et nefariorum flagitiorum et spurcitiarum immundarum fecundissimam, de quibus gemens dolensque conqueritur S. Bernardus (*Serm. in Cantica*, 66), Germania fremuit indignabunda, et jugum Cleri Christiani collo excutere nisa est. Recordamini, quæso, Principum vestrorum inclytorum, Ferdinandi Secundi et Maximiliani Secundi, Imperatorum, et Sigismundi Augusti, Poloniæ Regis, et Alberti Ducis Bavarici, qui Tridentini Concilii Patres vehementer sunt obtestati, ut antiquam Sacerdotii Christiani immunitatem restituere non refragarentur.

Agite ergo, Viri ornatissimi, et Patrum vestrorum memores illustria illorum exempla æmulamini.

Possemus, si tempus sineret, ad Concilii Nicæni Patres appellare, qui Sacerdotio Christiano Matrimonium interdicere rogati strenuè id postulantibus adversati sunt (*Gelas. Cyzic. Hist. Concil. Nic.* ii. 32, *cp. Socrat. H. E.* i. 11). Possemus nomina veterum Episcoporum conjugatorum, et cum uxoribus suis in sancto matrimonio et in casto amore ad mortem usque degentium, recitare. Ecquis ignorat S. Gregorium Nazianzenum, Patriarcham olim Constantinopolitanum, de Patre suo Episcopo et de piâ ejus Conjuge eloquentissimè coram populo verba facientem? (*Greg. Nazianz. Orationes* vii., xviii, ed. Paris. 1778.) Ecquis nescit eundem Antistitem epistolâ suavissimâ (*Epist.* 95) consolantem de morte conjugis S. Gregorium Nyssæ Episcopum, qui in Concilio Constantinopolitano inter primarios Præsules exstitit, et cui Symboli Nicæni complementum debet Ecclesia? S. Patritius Hiberniæ nostræ Apostolus patrem et avum habuit sacris ordinibus initiatos. S. Hilarius Pictaviensis, S. Paulinus Nolanus, uterque Episcopus, sanctitate vitæ et fidei puritate notissimus, cum uxore convixit.[1]

[1] In the Apostolical Canons, Canon 5, it is decreed, "If a Bishop or Priest eject his wife on the plea of sanctity, let him be excommunicated." Compare Concil. Trullan. can. 13, Canon. Apostol. 50; and in the Council

Sed patientiæ vestræ parcendum est, et ad alia jam festinandum. Lex ipsa Pontificia, Jus inquam Canonicum, ingenuè fatetur, Copulam Sacerdotalem nec Legali, nec Evangelicâ, nec Apostolicâ auctoritate prohiberi (*Caus.* 26, qu. 2, c. 1). Confessio sanè justa, et necessaria. Sacerdotio Levitico Matrimonium non tantùm non interdictum, sed quodammodo commendatum et quasi præscriptum fuisse nôrunt omnes. Etenim summum Sacerdotium in Aaronis familiâ, hereditariâ successione erat continuandum; et Sacerdotium Tribui Leviticæ lege erat adstrictum. Matrimonio igitur Sacerdotum cessante, cessâsset ipsum sacerdotium.

Prophetas Hebræorum, viros sanctissimos et Spiritu Sancto afflatos, Moysen, Samuelem, Esaiam, Ezechielem conjugatos fuisse, et filios habuisse, rectè notat S. Chrysostomus (*Hom.* 56 in S. Matt.). Sed cur in Sacerdotibus legalibus, cur in Hebræorum Prophetis, a Deo inspiratis, immoramur? S. Petrus, Princeps Apostolorum, cujus successorem se esse gloriatur Pontifex Romanus, non tantùm uxorem habuit (Matt. viii. 14), sed cum eâ in Apostolatu convixisse, et eam comitem itinerum Apostolicorum secum duxisse, testatur Paulus Apostolus (1 Cor. ix. 5); id quod a *ceteris* quoque *Apostolis* factitatum esse memorat, et *a fratribus Domini.* Uxorem S. Petri ad latus adhæsisse, et ad martyrium præcessisse, refert Clemens Alexandrinus (apud *Euseb. H. E.* iii. 30). Rectè igitur fatetur Tertullianus Matrimonii Censor parùm æquus (in *Exhort. ad Castit.* c. 8) "licuisse et Apostolis nubere, et uxorem circumducere."

Quid plura? In Episcopatum, Presbyteratem, et Diaconatum conjugatos cooptari, ad familiam piè educandam, in exemplum gregis sibi commissi, voce Sancti Pauli Apostoli jubet Spiritus Dei (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6). *In omnibus Connubium esse honorabile* docet Apostolus (Heb. xiii. 4); et dum voluntarium Cœlibatum laudat, omnibus sine exceptione Matrimonium concedit atque commendat, si res ita postulat, *ad fornicationes vitandas, unusquisque uxorem suam habeat* (1 Cor. vii. 2), et eos *qui prohibent nubere* inter Antichristianismi fautores disertè enumerat (1 Tim. iv. 13).

of Gangra (A.D. 362) an anathema is pronounced against those who scruple to receive the Communion from a married Priest.

Ipsa Romana Ecclesia Orientalis Ecclesiæ Sacerdotes conjugatos verè esse Sacerdotes non audet infitiari. Quod in Oriente legitimum est, cur in Occidente vetatur? Homines, Sacerdotio suscepto, non cessant esse homines; cur contra humanam naturam rebellatur, cur Deo naturæ resistitur?

A parte igitur nostrâ habemus Leviticæ legis Sacerdotes, habemus Prophetas Divino Spiritu afflatos, habemus Apostolos, habemus Prophetarum et Apostolorum Ducem atque Doctorem, habemus CHRISTUM. His gravibus testimoniis atque auctoribus contenti sumus. Contra hos si quid Ecclesia quævis imperaverit, id non a Christo profectum esse, sed a spiritu Antichristi, fidenter asseveramus.

Macte igitur estote, Viri præstantissimi, et primitivam Sacerdotio Christiano libertatem vindicate. Sic DEUS vobis favebit, Qui Matrimonium in Paradiso instituit, et Adamo Evam adduxit, et nuptiis ejus benedixit. Vobis favebit CHRISTUS, Immaculatus Ecclesiæ Sponsus, Qui primum suum miraculum ad conjugium honestandum edidit. Vobis afflatu Suo favebit SPIRITUS SANCTUS Paracletus, Qui omnia gratiâ suâ fecundans et divinæ columbæ similitudine Sese manifestans, Se esse casti amoris præconem atque ministrum universo orbi declaravit.

Vale, Vir ornatissime, et nos ama. Scribebam Brugis Belgarum, in Dominicâ XV. post Trinitatem, MDCCCLXXII.

Let me here insert an English translation of the above letter.

The Bishop of Lincoln to the President of the Congress of the Old Catholics at Cologne.

SIR,

I have received a letter from the Rev. Hyacinthe Loyson, informing me of his marriage, which recently took place in London—not being permitted in France—and forwarding to me a copy of a communication addressed by him to you, in which he requests that the question may be submitted to the vote of the Congress at Cologne, whether he, having been invited to the Congress, and being very desirous of

being present at it, will be welcomed by its members; or whether they will exclude him from their assembly, on account of the marriage he has contracted, on the ground that such an act is incompatible with the position he holds as a Priest of the Catholic Church?

I should be unwilling to mix myself up with this grave question, for fear of appearing to intrude in a matter which did not concern me, unless I had been appealed to by a person whom I honour for his integrity and ability, and lest I should seem to desert a friend who is the object of attack and obloquy.

I am actuated also by another consideration, which induces me, most learned Sir, to address you in this letter, though it must needs be hastily written by me while on a journey. We, the Bishops and Presbyters of the English Church, greatly honour Celibacy, when voluntarily chosen by a Christian Priest for the sake of God's glory and the salvation of souls; but we altogether deny that it ought to be imposed, as a thing necessary, on all Christian Ministers; and further we affirm, that holy Matrimony is not only a comfort to a Christian Priest, and a help to his spiritual life, but that it is also an efficacious instrument for the good example and edification of the people committed to his charge.

This question, therefore, which has now been propounded to you, concerns us also. It involves another inquiry—viz. whether you are willing to receive as Old Catholics us Bishops and Presbyters of the English Church, who hold such opinions as these concerning the marriage of Christian Priests?

It is a fortunate circumstance, honourable Sir, that this question is to be decided by you who are among the leading men of Germany. Not to mention the ability, constancy, and learning which qualify you for a determination of this question, it is a thing well known to all, that Germany has vindicated in this respect with manly boldness the rights and privileges of the Christian Priesthood. Who has not heard of the brave protests of that holy man, your Waldric Bishop of Augsburg, contending in the ninth century against

Pope Nicholas the First for the liberties of a married priesthood? and when Pope Gregory the Seventh, Hildebrand, prohibited the marriage of Priests, and imposed upon them that wretched bondage which has borne the bitter fruits of unutterable profligacy and the foulest uncleanness, as the holy Bernard laments with groans and tears, Germany sent forth a cry of indignation, and strove to shake off the yoke from the neck of the Priesthood. Let me entreat you to call to mind the names of those your illustrious Princes, the Emperors Ferdinand the Second and Maximilian the Second, Sigismond Augustus, King of Poland, and Albert, Duke of Bavaria, who earnestly conjured the Fathers of the Council of Trent to restore the ancient liberties of the Christian Ministry. Let me implore you, accomplished Sir, to remember the glorious names of your ancestors, and to imitate their examples.

If time allowed, I might refer to the Fathers of the Council of Nicæa, who, being desired by some to forbid the Christian Priesthood to marry, made a strenuous opposition to that proposal. I might remind you of the names of ancient Bishops who were married, and who lived with their wives in holy matrimony and in chaste love to the day of their death. Who is there that does not know that S. Gregory Nazianzen, who was Archbishop of Constantinople, delivered eloquent sermons in public concerning his father, Bishop of that See, and his pious wife? Who is there that has not heard that the same Prelate consoled in a very touching letter his dear friend who had lost his wife, S. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, who held a chief place among the Bishops in the Council of Constantinople, and to whom the Church owes the completion of the Nicene Creed? The father and grandfather of S. Patrick, the Apostle of our Ireland, were in Holy Orders, as he himself tells us. S. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, S. Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, both of them Prelates distinguished by the holiness of their lives and the purity of their faith, lived in the state of matrimony.

But I must spare your patience, and hasten to another topic. The Papal Code,—the Canon Law,—frankly confesses

that "the marriage of Priests is not forbidden by the Mosaic Code, nor by the Gospel of Christ, nor by the authority of the Apostles." A just and necessary avowal. Yet more; the Levitical Code not only did not interdict marriage to the Levitical Priesthood, but it rather commended and prescribed it. The High Priesthood was to be continued by hereditary succession in the family of Aaron, and the Priesthood was limited to the Tribe of Levi. Therefore, if the marriage of Levitical Priests had ceased, there would have been a cessation of the Levitical Priesthood.

It is well noted by S. Chrysostom, in one of his homilies, that the Hebrew Prophets, who were renowned for their sanctity, and were inspired by the Holy Ghost,—such as Moses, Samuel, Isaiah, Ezekiel,—were married, and had children. But why speak of Levitical Priests or Hebrew Prophets? St. Peter himself, the first of the Apostles, he whose successor the Bishop of Rome boasts himself to be, not only had a wife, but lived with her during his Apostleship, and led her about with him as a companion in his Apostolic journeys, as St. Paul himself states, who adds that the same thing was done by the "rest of the Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord." We are informed by Clement of Alexandria that St. Peter's wife remained in his company till her death, and went before him to martyrdom. Rightly, therefore, is it confessed by Tertullian, who was not biassed in favour of matrimony, "that it was lawful for the Apostles to marry, and to lead about their wives with them" in their missionary travels.

Yet further. The Holy Spirit of God, speaking by the mouth of the Apostle St. Paul, enjoins that married persons should be ordained and consecrated to the Episcopate, Presbyterate, and Diaconate of the Church; that they may be examples to the flock by the pious education and godly rule of their families. "Marriage is honourable among all men," says the Apostle. And while he praises voluntary celibacy, he concedes and commends marriage to all men without exception, if their circumstances require it. "To avoid fornication," he says, "let every one have his own

wife;" and yet more, they, "who forbid to marry" are classed by him among the followers of Antichrist.

The Church of Rome herself does not dare to deny that the Priests of the Eastern Church, who are married, are right and lawful Priests. What is right and lawful in the East, why is it forbidden by her in the West? Men do not cease to be men when they become Priests. Why this rebellion against Human nature?—why this resistance to Nature's God?

We have on our side the Priests of the Levitical Law; we have on our side the Hebrew Prophets, inspired by the Holy Ghost; we have the Apostles; we have the Leader, Teacher, and Lord of Prophets and Apostles—Jesus Christ. We are content with these authorities. And if any Church upon earth dares to command anything which is opposed to them, we confidently affirm that such a command does not come from Christ, but from the spirit of Antichrist.

Take courage, therefore, honoured Sirs, and restore its primitive liberty to the Christian Priesthood. In so doing you will be favoured by God, who instituted marriage in Paradise, and brought Eve to Adam and pronounced a blessing on their wedlock. You will be favoured by Christ, the Immaculate Bridegroom of the Church, who worked His first miracle for the adornment of Marriage. You will receive a benediction from the Holy Ghost the Comforter, who makes all things fruitful by His grace, and who made Himself manifest in the likeness of a Dove at the Baptism of Christ, and thus declared to the world that He is the Herald and Minister of chaste and pure love.

Farewell, accomplished Sir, and honour me with your friendship. Bruges, on the fifteenth Sunday after Trinity, 1872.

C. LINCOLN.

I arrived at Cologne from Aix-la-Chapelle on the evening of Monday, September 15th.

Père Hyacinthe received a letter from the President of the Cologne Committee, informing him that there was no wish on his part to withdraw the invitation that had been sent to

him. Accordingly, Père Hyacinthe came to Cologne, and was present at the sessions of the Congress. The question, however, of *enforced* clerical celibacy was reserved for future consideration. It was mentioned incidentally at some of the meetings; and there could be little doubt as to the opinion of the Congress upon it.

The obligation to celibacy has now been abolished; and the Clergy of the Old Catholics are permitted to marry (Dec. 1878).

ON SISTERHOODS AND VOWS.

From the consideration of the Law of Marriage and Divorce we may pass to the question of Vows of Celibacy in the Sisterhoods of the Church of England. The following letter on that subject was written by me to the Ven. Sir George Prevost, Bart., Archdeacon of Gloucester (June 1, 1878).

My dear Sir George,

When some weeks ago you favoured me with a copy of the Report of the Committee—whose Chairman you were—of the Lower House of Convocation on "Sisterhoods and Deaconesses," you accompanied it with a request for such remarks as might occur to me in reading it. Since that time, that Report has been discussed in an interesting debate in the Lower House, and a Joint Committee of both Houses of the Convocation of this Province has been appointed to suggest resolutions upon it.[1]

The subject is one of much importance and intricacy; it demands careful consideration and study, and requires that statements with respect to it should be made with caution, clearness, and accuracy. I should therefore feel some difficulty in dealing with it in the ordinary limits of a speech in Convocation; and I am thankful to be allowed to avail myself of the opportunity you have kindly offered me of

[1] The words of the resolution, moved by Sir George Prevost, and seconded by Canon Rawlinson (with a slight amendment by Canon Simmons), were as follows:—

"That their Lordships of the Upper House be humbly requested to direct their attention to the recognition and regulation of these Institutions by the Synods of the Church; and (if they should think good) to appoint, by his Grace's authority, a Joint Committee to lay down the general principles upon which such recognition and regulation may be based."

expressing my thoughts upon it in writing. The subject is now more important, because it has been engaging the attention of the Sister Church of America in her last three General Conventions.

And first let me premise that I fully concur in the language of cordial sympathy and admiration with which the Report speaks of the self-devotion of those Christian women who are associated in Sisterhoods, and who have laboured earnestly in the cause of Christ and His Church.

It has been my happiness to have been connected with a Sisterhood since its foundation thirty years ago,—the Sisterhood of St. John the Evangelist,—which has now the charge of nursing the sick in two of the principal Hospitals in London—King's College Hospital and Charing Cross Hospital; and the authorities of both those great institutions have borne honourable testimony to the services rendered by the Sisters of St. John's House in elevating the character of nurses, and in ministering to the sick and suffering. The work done by Sisterhoods in maintaining and advancing Christian Education, at home and abroad, and in other labours of Christian love, are entitled to grateful acknowledgment.

It is evident that their excellence and value in these and other respects suggest strong motives for the wise counsels and salutary warnings of your Committee, lest through any flaws or blemishes in their organization, or by any indiscretions or irregularities in their acts, their "good should be evil spoken of," and their work be marred and hindered. Rather let us hope and pray that by the divine blessing on the deliberations of the Synod of this Province, in this grave matter, the cause of Sisterhoods may be strengthened and promoted, and their usefulness increased and consolidated.

In dealing with this subject the primary appeal must be to Holy Scripture.

There can be no doubt that St. Paul speaks of celibacy as affording special advantages for holiness of life. He wishes that all men were like himself in that respect. But in doing so he never forgets what human nature is, and that different persons have different gifts from God (1 Cor. vii. 7; xii. 11;

cf. Matt. xix. 11, 12). He condemns those who forbid to marry (1 Tim. iv. 3), he says that marriage is honourable in all (Heb. xiii. 4), he wills that younger women should marry (1 Tim. v. 14), he says, for reasons derived from human infirmity, "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband" (1 Cor. vii. 2).

This being the case, we find that the Apostle is very cautious in his directions with regard to the self-dedication of women to singleness of life. Though widows may be supposed to have been chastened by sorrow, he will not allow them to be set apart by a vow of celibacy to the service of Christ and His Church, and be enrolled as such, till they have attained the age of sixty years[2] (1 Tim. v. 9).

Some indeed have imagined (see below, page 287) that St. Paul is here speaking of *almswomen*, to be *maintained* from the funds of the Church. No doubt these widows were entitled to maintenance from the Church, but it was because they gave themselves by voluntary dedication, to the service of the Church. This is clear from the context, where he commands the Bishop of Ephesus, St. Timothy, to reject *younger widows* who may offer themselves for such dedication: the reason given for this prohibition being that "when they have waxed wanton against Christ *they will marry*," or rather, they *wish to marry*,[3] and incur severe sentence of censure by annulling their troth to Christ (1 Tim. v. 12).

It may, I conceive, be fairly argued, that since St. Paul commands that widows are not to be allowed by the Church to dedicate themselves by a vow of celibacy before they are

[2] The age for a deaconess, by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, c. 15, was *forty years;* but in Cod. Theodos. de Episcopis Leg. 27, "Nulla nisi emensis *sexaginta* annis *secundum Apostoli præceptum* ad diaconissarum consortium provehatur." See also Ziegler de Diaconissis; Wittenberg, 1678, pp. 351—356.

[3] On this statement of St. Paul, see S. Augustine de sancta Virginitate, cap. 34, and de bono Viduitatis, cap. 12. Our English translation "*they will marry*" hardly suggests to the reader the true meaning of the original γαμεῖν θέλουσι, "nubere volunt" (Vulg.), i. e. *they wish to marry*, —whether in fact they marry or no. The word "damnation" in our version (derived from the Vulgate here) is not to be understood according to the more modern and rigorous sense of it.

sixty years of age, he would not have permitted the Church to impose upon young unmarried women a vow of celibacy, or have allowed them to take such a vow of celibacy in the presence of Bishops or Priests of the Church.

This conclusion appears to be confirmed by sub-Apostolic testimony. S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch and disciple of St. John says,[4] "Do not impose on any one the yoke of celibacy; for it is a perilous thing and hard to be kept, when it is laid on by constraint. Exhort young men to marry." He also says,[5] "If any one is able to remain in holy celibacy, for the glory of the Lord of his flesh, let him so abide without boasting; if he boasts he perishes." And again,[6] "Whoever says anything against the divine rules, even though he fasts and lives in celibacy, let him be deemed by thee to be a wolf in sheep's clothing, tearing the flock."

It seems that unmarried women were enrolled into the same Ecclesiastical order as widows, and probably at the same age, and were even sometimes styled *widows* on that account. S. Ignatius says in one of his Epistles, "I salute the *Virgins* who are called *widows*."[7]

This is confirmed by a passage of Tertullian, in the following century, who, though a rigid ascetic and no friend to marriage, expresses his great astonishment that a Virgin had been admitted (probably in some schismatical or heretical society) among the widows at the age of twenty years.[8] He then mentions the rule of the Church that its widows should be sixty years of age, and he describes the functions of those who were engaged as such, in works of piety, mercy, and charity.

In the next age, Tertullian's follower, St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, says plainly that at that time (the first half of the third century) there were young unmarried women who devoted themselves to labours of love, and who seemed to have an intention and purpose (propositum) of leading a

[4] S. Ignatius, Fragment vi.

[5] S. Ignat. ad Polyc. cap. 5.

[6] S. Ignatius, Frag. ix.

[7] S. Ignat. ad Smyrn., cap. 13. See Bishop Jacobson's notes on the passage.

[8] Tertullian, de Virginibus velandis, cap. 9.

single life;[9] but he distinctly says that they were under no vow of celibacy, and were free to marry; and, in certain circumstances they were advised to do so.

"If," says he,[1] "they have dedicated themselves faithfully to Christ, let them persevere in modesty and chastity, and so, in strength and stableness, let them hope for the reward of virginity. But if they are unwilling or unable to persevere, it is better for them to marry than to fall into the fire by their sins. Certainly let not them put any stumbling-block in the way of their brethren or sisters." He evidently implies that their marriage would not cause offence. And as the learned Editor of S. Cyprian's works, Bishop Fell, remarks in his notes on the passage, "They dedicated themselves to Christ by *purpose of mind* and public profession of virginity, but were not *bound by any vow*," and the erudite French Roman-Catholic Editor Rigaltius agrees with the English Bishop in this opinion.

In the following ages of the Church, that is, in the latter part of the fourth century and during the fifth, a change took place in these respects. Social life at Rome (as S. Jerome shows) was dissolved. The Barbarians from the North-East, sweeping on in successive waves of inundation, overwhelmed Italy and Africa. Even in the days of S. Ambrose (A.D. 340—397) property and person were insecure, and the havoc made at the capture of Rome by the Goths (A.D. 410), and the desolation of Africa by the Vandals, are themes for lamentation and woe in the letters and other works of S. Jerome (A.D. 345—420) and S. Augustine (A.D. 354—430).

No wonder that on account of the then "present distress" (1 Cor. vii. 26) single life had special attractions for young women; and their parents would not be unwilling to encourage this profession. The cares of a family would press heavily upon those who were married, and the uncertainty

[9] In those days, as the learned Roman Catholic writer Thomassinus observes (de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl., part i. lib. iii. vol. iii. p. 355), "Frequentior *intentio* (virginitatis) quam *professio* aperta."

[1] S. Cyprian, Epist. ad Pomponium, p. 8, ed. Fell, Amst., 1691, a reprint of the Oxford edition of 1682.

and vicissitude of all earthly things, when at last Rome herself, the queen of the world,[2] became a captive and sat in sackcloth and ashes, raised the eyes of the faithful upward to their heavenly King and to their eternal home.

The Bishop of Milan, S. Ambrose, had been the great preacher of celibacy in the West, and he was followed by S. Jerome and S. Augustine. The writings of these Fathers[3] on this subject deserve careful attention; to which may be added the Treatise on Virginity, ascribed by some to S. Basil, in the East, the contemporary of S. Ambrose.

S. Ambrose inculcates the doctrine of St. Paul, that widows should not be enrolled as such in the service of the Church under a vow of celibacy till sixty years of age; and that younger widows should be refused[4] as not qualified for the work; and S. Basil says,[5] "If a widow (of the Church) who has passed her sixtieth year contracts a second marriage, she is to be excommunicated till she repents. But if we have admitted a widow into the roll *before that age*, it is not the woman's fault, if she marries, but ours." S. Ambrose says that Virginity is not to be imposed on any. "Virginitas non imponitur sed præponitur."[6]

The admission of the Virgins into the service of the Church was fenced by many safeguards. By the canons of some churches (even after the days of St. Ambrose) a Virgin could not be admitted before the age of forty.[7] She could

[2] See S. Jerome, Epist. xcvi., ad Principiam Virginem, p. 783.

[3] S. Ambrose, de Virginibus, ad Marcellinam sororem, libri tres (tom. iii. pp. 224—249). De Viduis, liber unus, pp. 250—266. De Virginitate, pp. 267—288. De Institutione Virginis, liber unus, pp. 289—305. Exhortatio Virginitatis, pp. 306—322. De Lapsu Virginis, pp. 323—331.

S. Jerome, Epist. xviii. ad Eustochium de custodiâ Virginitatis, p. 27. Epist. xcvii, ad Demetriadem de servandâ Virginitate, p. 784, tom. iv. ed. Paris, 1706.

S. Augustine, de bono Conjugali, vi. 542—570. De Sanctâ Virginitate, pp, 579—618. De bono Viduitatis, pp. 626—650, tom. vi. ed. Paris, 1837.

S. Basil, de verâ Virginitate, tom. iii. p. 589, ed. Paris, 1730. This Treatise was written in the fourth century; but not probably by S. Basil.

[4] De Viduis, cap. 2. [5] S. Basil, Canon. ad Amphiloch, Ep. 2.

[6] Ibid. cap. 12. See also S. Augustine, de Sanctâ Virginitate, c. 30, "Non ex necessitate, sed vestræ voluntatis."

[7] Council of Saragossa, A.D. 418, Can. 8. This was passed unanimously, and so the Council of Agde, A.D. 506, Can. 19.

not be admitted by a Priest.[8] The approval of the Bishop of the Diocese was requisite.[9] The Bishop, not the abbess, was to have the oversight of them.[1] The Bishop was obliged to proceed in the matter with great caution and deliberation. He must examine into her character[2] and qualifications with scrupulous attention. He must inquire whether (pray remark this) *she would be under the safe custody of her mother,* and the grave attendance of companions. If such conditions as these were not satisfied, she was not to be received.

When she had been dedicated as a Virgin, she then became a spouse of Christ,[3] and had renounced the world; her life was to be one of holy exercises, of rigid asceticism, of private seclusion. Her chamber was to be an oratory;[4] she was to pass her days there in fasting and prayer, in singing psalms and hymns, in reading Holy Scripture; she was allowed to do some women's works; she was not permitted to leave[5] the house, "prodire domo nescia," says S. Ambrose,[6] unless to go to church; she was forbidden to converse with men, even with holy men;[7] and with women, except her nearest relations.[8] If the virgin had no parents, and could not dwell at home, she was consigned to the care of some grave matrons in a monastery, which she was never

[8] Council of Rouen, Can. 9.

[9] Concil. Carthag. iii. Can. 36.

[1] Fifth Council of Arles, Can. 5, "The Bishop is to have the oversight of the Monasteries of the Virgins; and the Abbess must do nothing contrary to the rules."

[2] S. Ambrose, de Virginitate, cap. 7.

[3] "Immortali nupsisti Viro," says S. Ambrose, de Lapsu Virginis, c. 5.

[4] S. Jerome, Epist. 98, ad Gaudentium, "*In cubiculo* suo totas delicias habeat; discat memoriter psalterium; libros Salomonis, Evangelia, Apostolos et Prophetas sui cordis thesaurum faciat."

S. Ambrose, de Virginibus, iii. 15, and de Inst. Virg. cap. 16. S. Ambrose, Exhortat. cap. 9, "Quære Christum in *cubiculo* tuo," &c.

[5] De Virgin. ii. 2.

[6] De Inst. Virg. cap. 1, and Exhort. Virg. cap. 10. "Nullus sit tuus sine matre processus; ipsa quoque ad Ecclesiam processio rarior sit adolescentulis." S. Basil, de Virg. cap. 19.

[7] S. Basil, de Virgin. cap. 37.

[8] S. Ambrose, Exhort. Virg. cap. 10.

to leave,[9] except for special reasons. No one had free access to her there[1] but the bishop,[2] and the priest who came to celebrate the offices of the Church.

Such was the condition of the Virgins of the Church in the latter part of the fourth century, and in the fifth and sixth centuries.

In addition to these cautionary measures, by which the Virgins of the Church were precluded from opportunities of intercourse with men, and from temptation to break their vow of celibacy, any violation of that vow was denounced by the doctors[3] of the Church in stern language, and was visited by the canons[4] of the Church with severe penalties. Thus the Church in her motherly frankness and plainness of speech set the matter clearly before the eyes of fervid postulants, and doubtless deterred many from rashly taking a vow of celibacy.

If this system had been based on sound foundations of human nature and Holy Scripture, it must be confessed to have been a wise one. It had the merit of logical consistency. It exhorted virgins *not* to take a vow of celibacy unless they felt that they had the gift to keep it.[5] It withdrew the Virgins of the Church from temptation, it supplied them with means of grace to resist it, and it deterred them from yielding to it by authoritative alarms and solemn anathemas.

But although the system was thus fenced in on all sides, it was not successful. It seems to have often fostered spiritual pride.[6] The lamentation of Fathers of the Church

[9] See S. Basil, Epitimia Canonicarum, ii. 530. Concil. Trullan Can. 41.

[1] Concil. Carthag. i. 3.

[2] S. Ambrose, de Lapsu Virginis, cap. 7. Council of Epaon, Can. 38. Council of Rouen, Can. 10.

[3] S. Basil, de Virgin. caps. 39, 40, 42. S. Ambrose, de Lapsu Virg. c. 5. S. Epiphanius, Hæres. c. 61. S. Augustin, de bono Viduit. cap. 9.

[4] Concil. Ancyran, Can. 19. Concil. Turon. i. 6. Concil. Venet. Can. 4. Concil. Valent. i. 2. Concil. Matiscon i. Can. 12. Thomassinus, Eccl. Disc. tom. iv. p. 63.

[5] S. Augustine, de bono Viduit. cap. 8, "Si non continent nubant, antequam continentiam profiteantur."

[6] See S. Augustine, de sanctâ Virginitate, caps. 34, 44, 45. The

on cases of failure,[7] their exhortations, even to professed virgins, to marry rather than to live the lives which some of them were tempted to do,[8] and the frequent iterations of canonical censures on the breaches of the vow of celibacy, seem to prove that the taking of vows of celibacy by women on any other terms than those which had been enunciated by St. Paul (1 Tim. v. 9—12), and had been accepted by the Primitive Church, was dangerous in its tendency, and disastrous in its results.

And now, my dear Sir George, let me be allowed to ask your indulgence, while I attempt to apply these statements to the subject of your Report.

And first, with regard to the terms *Sister* and *Sisterhood*, in that Report, and as now used in the English Church.

It must be candidly confessed, that these words, as at present employed among us, do not correspond to anything known to the Christian Church for a thousand years. I am not saying that those persons whom they represent are the worse on that account. Every age of the Church knows its own needs, and must endeavour to provide for them by special means, adapted to their peculiar character and circumstances.

But let us try to have clear ideas on the subject; and let us not confound things that are widely different, and let us not hastily apply ancient terms and ancient rules to modern inventions.

The word *Sisterhood* has no correlative in the terminology of the ancient Greek or Latin Church, It is unknown to both; it would not be possible to translate it by any word

Council of Gangra, A.D. 362, gives salutary cautions against this temper of mind (Canons 1, 4, 9), and against the tendency to Manichæanism which disparaged Marriage. The wise language of the Bishops assembled in this Council deserves careful consideration at the present time.

[7] See for example S. Ambrose, de Lapsu Virginis, p. 323. S. Jerome, Epist. xciii. ad Sabinianum Lapsum, p. 754.

[8] See S. Jerome, ad Demetriad, Ep. xcviii. "Sanctum Virginum propositum quarundam non benè agentium nomen infamat. Quibus aperte dicendum est, ut aut nubant, si se non possunt continere, aut contineant si nolunt nubere." See also S. Epiphan. Hæres. 61.

used by either. The ancient Church had its *Widows*, it had its *Virgins*, it had its *Deaconesses*, but it had *no Sisterhoods* in the modern sense of the term.

And what may we infer from this? Not that Sisterhoods are bad things; not that they may not be very excellent things; no, far from it; but that it is unreasonable to apply ancient regulations to them.

Let me illustrate my meaning by a pertinent example in a very grave and serious matter.

I infer from your Report to the Lower House of Convocation, that, in some English Sisterhoods the Sisters at an *early age are allowed to take vows of celibacy of perpetual obligation*.[9] This, I venture to think, is repugnant to the teaching of the Apostolic age, as seen in the writings of St. Paul; and it is not consistent with that of the next age of the Church, that of S. Ignatius, Tertullian, and S. Cyprian; and it is also at variance even with the precepts and practice of the most earnest advocates of celibacy, S. Ambrose, S. Basil, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine, in the fourth and fifth centuries. As to the last-named, let me explain what I mean.

If a young woman in our Sisterhoods were never admitted to take a vow, and to be veiled by a Priest of the Church, but only by the Bishop of the Diocese, and not even by the Bishop, except after careful scrutiny and examination; and if, after she had taken a vow of celibacy, she were not allowed to go out of her own house, even to church, except under most careful custody; or if, not living at home but in the house of the Sisterhood, she were denied all intercourse with the external world, except in going to church, and even that under watchful guardianship; and if her friends and relatives were not freely admitted to visit her; if, in a word, she were carefully guarded in perfect privacy and strict seclusion, against all inducement to break her vow, or to attract others by the graces of her person and character; and if the Church in her Synods had warned her by solemn comminations against the breach of her vow, and against the consequences of such

[9] "The final Vows are in some cases perpetual," Report, p. 6.

violation, *then there would be* indeed some analogy between the Virgins of the age of S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine, and the English Sister of the nineteenth century; —but *not otherwise.*

I frankly confess, that when I read in your Report that vows of perpetual celibacy are allowed and encouraged in some English Sisterhoods, and when I know what blessings the Sisters diffuse by the English liberty of their holy lives, in nursing the sick in Hospitals, and in the homes of the poor and fever-stricken, and in teaching young children in schools, and in other labours of love at home and abroad, as missionaries of the blessed Gospel, by their influence and example; and when I see that some of them travel by railways from place to place, and even present themselves at the houses of strangers, in great towns, to solicit offerings for their Sisterhoods, I cannot help saying to myself, What would S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, and S. Jerome have thought, and what would they have said to all this? What would they, who sat in the Synods of the ancient Church, have thought and said, if they were told at the same time that these youthful sisters, so free and so attractive, were under vows of perpetual celibacy?

To state briefly the inferences from all this. If our English Sisters are to be in harmony with the Apostolic age, let them not be allowed to take vows of perpetual celibacy till the age specified by St. Paul. If they prefer to live, as it were, in the fourth or fifth centuries, and to take such vows of celibacy when they are young, let them not be allowed to go forth from their own homes, or let them be shut up in a cloister. But let them not do what your Report says that some of them are doing, that is, let them not take vows of celibacy at an early age and yet live in public, and appeal to Catholic Antiquity as an authority for what they do.

I have written thus freely, because with you and other members of your Committee, and with those excellent men who addressed the Lower House of Convocation in the recent debate on the subject, I earnestly pray for the prosperity of English Sisterhoods, and because I am sure

that by the divine blessing they will prosper, unless they injure and destroy themselves by ill-advised rules and indiscreet practices, which cannot plead any precedent from any age of the Church for a thousand years after Christ.

I ought perhaps to advert here to a class of women in the ancient Church who may be thought to bear some resemblance to our English Sisters, so far as freedom is concerned, and also as being dedicated by a Vow of Celibacy (I am not speaking of the Apostolic age, but of the fourth century)—I mean *Deaconesses*. These were consecrated by a solemn service to their work, and were very useful as ministers in the Christian Church, especially in the instruction of women, and in preparing them for Baptism and Confirmation, and in teaching of children, and in succouring the sick and needy.[1] But they did not live in communities or sisterhoods. It is remarkable that their case is rather a warning than an example to us, and thus it may be useful to us. They represented an attempt—such as is now made by some sisterhoods—to reconcile freedom of life with vows of celibacy; and the experiment failed. After a fair trial the office of Deaconess so constituted was suppressed, and canons were passed against its continuance, in the fifth and sixth centuries in the Western Church.[2]

I do not mean to say that an order of *Deaconesses* might not be constituted on *primitive Apostolic* principles, and do much good; I believe it might. Indeed, the experiment has been tried in our own age and country with much success.

I should be chargeable with a serious omission if I did not here refer to the celebrated institution founded by S. Vincent de Paul in the early part of the seventeenth

[1] See the authorities in Bingham, Antiquities of the Church, book ii. chap. xxii. 1—13.

[2] First Council of Orange, Can. 26, A.D. 441, and Council of Epaon, Can. 21. Second Council of Orleans, Can. 18, A.D. 533. It failed through human frailty not able to bear it, "pro conditionis hujus fragilitate," says the Council. Cp. Thomassinus, Disciplin. Eccl. vol. x. p. 78.

century (A.D. 1633); the Sisters of Charity, now numbering 18,000 members, of whom 14,000 are natives of France.[3]

These Sisters (like our English Sisters) enjoy much liberty. In the words of their saintly founder, "Their only monastery is the house of the sick, their chapel is the parish church, their cloister is the street of the city or the ward of the hospital, their seclusion is obedience, their *grille* is the fear of God, their veil is holy modesty and meekness."

But let us consider what their constitution is. A good account of it is given by M. Collet in his interesting life of S. Vincent de Paul, published at Paris in 1818 (p. 42), who states that the Sisters take no vow at all till after five years' probation; and then they are allowed to take a vow *for a year;* and in an interesting volume,[4] published in London in 1854, it is stated (p. 94), in the history of this celebrated Sisterhood, that "No external austerities were required, and *no Vows were taken beyond a year.*" Again (p. 98), "The Sisters of S. Vincent de Paul usually have no private means; they live with the poor whom they serve; they receive a small annual sum (12*l.* or 15*l.*) from the *Bureau de Bienfaisance* of any town in France that may wish for their services, or a small sum is granted them from the Mother-house. After admission they spend six months in their own dress, and then adopt that of the Order, and after five years' probation they are allowed to take the simple Vows, which are *only for one year,* and are *annually renewed on March 25th.* . . . . From time to time the Sisters return to the seminary to gain spiritual strength by a retreat of eight days for spiritual exercise of prayer and doctrinal instructions."

"Their constitution and rules were, in 1847, exactly the same as in St. Vincent's time" (p. 102). The "Filles de St. Geneviève" (founded 1636) take no Vows" (p. 106). The Order, therefore, of S. Vincent de Paul by its permanence, prosperity, and beneficent influence seems to supply direction and encouragement to us.

Whatever may be the value of other Roman Catholic

[3] See M. Guizot, Histoire de France, tome iv. p. 15.

[4] Entitled "Hospitals and Sisterhooods." London: Murray, 1854.

Sisterhoods, conducted on a much stricter plan, and which may exist more easily in conjunction with a clergy bound to celibacy, it can hardly be doubted that England would suffer much, socially, morally, and spiritually, if she were to purchase such institutions, with their vows of perpetual celibacy, at the cost of her own Sisters of Mercy and Charity, namely, the wives and daughters of her Parochial Clergy in all parts of the land.

I do not see in the Report any refereuce to other Vows, such as Vows of *Obedience* and *Poverty*, which are taken in some religious communities; nor do I know on what terms they are proposed and taken in English Sisterhoods.

But it may be well to observe, that, according to the Will and Word of God, no Vow can be rightly imposed or safely taken, which interferes with or contravenes any religious and moral obligation by which the person taking the Vow was *previously bound*.

And in the present case no Vow of Obedience to a Superior of a Sisterhood can be defended which militates against any clear duty to God, or to Parents.

And no Vow of Poverty can be justified, which interferes with the duties of piety to God (such as almsgiving) or to Parents. Such Vows are condemned by our Lord (Matt. xv. 5. Mark vii. 11), and by St. Paul (1 Tim. v. 8). On this subject let me refer to the excellent remarks of Bishop Sanderson in his Lectures on the Obligation of an Oath, and in his Cases of Conscience; especially Case iv. and Case viii.[5]

It may perhaps be alleged here, that the foregoing observations are not of a constructive character, and are not suggestive of measures to be adopted for the regulation of existing Sisterhoods.

I anticipate this objection; but let me say also that if I entered on this part of the subject, I might be encroaching

[5] The "Lectures" will be found in vol. iv., the "Cases of Conscience" in vol. v. of Bishop Jacobson's edition of Sanderson's Works. Oxford, 1854.

on the functions of the Joint Committee which has now been appointed for this purpose. At the risk, however, of appearing to do so, I would now briefly offer a few practical suggestions :—

(1.) That the general fundamental principles for the regulation of Sisterhoods should not be laid down by any Diocesan authority, but by the Provincial Synods of the Church.

(2.) That the application of those regulations in any Diocese should be entrusted to the Bishop of the Diocese.

(3.) That no vows of perpetual celibacy should be imposed; and that St. Paul's command (1 Tim. v. 9, see above, page 269) be complied with.

(4.) That a *promise* (not a Vow[6]) of self-dedication to the work might be made, but ought to be terminable, and not be extended beyond two or three years; and be renewable from time to time. And this being not a *Vow* to *God*, but a *promise* to a *human* authority, might, if circumstances so require, be relaxed by that authority.

There is much to be said in favour of a free, life-long self-dedication (*not*, however, under a Vow), to the work of a Sister. Such voluntary consecration gives strength, and stability to the Sisterhood. But there is also much to be urged in behalf of terminable engagements. There can be no better training for a wife and a mother than the work of a Sister, nursing in a hospital, or teaching in a good school. In one Sisterhood in London (St. John's) there have been and are a considerable number of "Lady Pupils," and very useful they are and will be. And it seems desirable for some young women, especially the daughters of the clergy, to have the advantage of two or three years' training as Sisters in a hospital, or in some well-ordered school, under efficient and skilful teachers.

(5.) That no one should be allowed to take any Vow except in the presence of the Bishop, and with solemn prayer and benediction from him.

(6.) That no Books of Devotion should be used in a

[6] On the difference between a *Vow* and a *Promise*, see Bishop Sanderson, de Juram. Oblig. lecture vii.

Sisterhood without the knowledge and approval of the Bishop.

(7.) That all admissions to the Sisterhood should be with a religious service and celebration of the Holy Communion, and in the presence of the Bishop.

(8.) That great care should be taken in the appointment of the Chaplain of the Sisterhood. More will depend for success on the personal zeal, faith, wisdom, and holiness of those who are engaged in the work, and of those laymen who are officially connected with it (whether Members of Council or others) than in any abstract regulations.

And now, my dear Sir George, before I bring these remarks to a close, may I say something on the case of Sisters who in early years have taken a Vow of Celibacy, and may perhaps feel that they have been entangled by them, without fully counting the cost.

Let it then be remembered here that—

(1.) A Vow is a solemn act of religious worship done to Almighty God.[7] A Vow ought never to be taken except with a feeling of solemn awe, inspired by a sense of His omnipresence, omniscience, and majesty; a consideration (let me observe) which ought to deter persons from hastily making *vows* of *total abstinence,* and, still more, from *imposing* them on others.

(2.) The *matter* of a Vow ought to be something good, pious, charitable, and holy. Almighty God, in Holy Scripture, warns men against making rash vows; at the same time He commands them to keep the vows which they have made (Eccles. v. 4—6); unless they were not free to make them (Numb. xxx. 3—7. Deut. xxiii. 21), and unless the vows are contrary to some moral obligation by which they were previously bound.[8]

(3.) The *purpose* of a life of celibacy in dependence on God's grace, and for the promoting His glory and the good

[7] See Bishop Sanderson, de Juramenti Obligatione, Prælect. vii. "Case of unlawful love," p. 13. His "Case of a Rash Vow," p. 118.

[8] Cp. Bishop Jeremy Taylor, *Ductor Dubitantium,* book iii. chap. v. rule viii.

of His Church, is holy and commendable; but it is not lawful to *impose* a Vow of Celibacy on any, especially on young persons. (1 Tim. iv. 3; v. 9. 1 Cor. vii. 2.)

(4.) It is a rash thing to take such a vow. Bishop Taylor's words deserve careful attention:[9]—"*That* man vows foolishly that binds himself for ever to the profession of what he may *afterwards find* not to be useful, or not profitable; but of some danger or of no necessity." He recommends that vows should rather be made for the performance of *special acts*, than for *continuance* in a *permanent state*.

Let me here observe in passing, that some have endeavoured to justify the taking of a Vow of celibacy by young persons, and even the imposition of it upon them, by examples of vows in the Old Testament, as the Nazarite Vow (Numb. vi.), or the case of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.), or the Vow of Marriage under the Gospel, or the Vow at Ordination, or the Baptismal Vow.

But the cases are by no means similar.

In the Old Testament the Vow of the Nazarite was one of Divine institution (Numb. vi.), it was *not* imposed on any one, and as far as appears from Scripture, it was not of perpetual obligation; and God, who instituted it, would endue those whom He directed to take it, with strength to keep it. Besides the *matter* of it was in no way contrariant to human nature, which is God's work. There was also a provision for the contingency of a breach of it, by way of dispensation (Numb. vi. 12).

But a Vow of Perpetual Celibacy has no warrant from God; rather it is repugnant to His will as manifested in nature and revealed in Scripture, and cannot look with assurance for the help of His grace to keep it.

The abstinence of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.) was no consequence of any Vow. Jonadab, the son of Rechab, is not praised or approved for laying the commands he did on his descendants (rather he was censurable for doing so), but *they are commended* for showing reverence to God, Whose

[9] Cp. Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Holy Living, sect. vii., "Cautions for making Vows," vol. iv. p. 225, ed. Heber, 1828.

command it is that Parents should be obeyed, and for showing love and honour to their father, and for their obedience to his command, although it is very doubtful whether the command ought to have been given.

In the Gospel dispensation, Marriage has become "a magnum sacramentum," a great mystery (Eph. v. 32), and the marriage vow is approved by God as being a solemn promise in His sight to keep that troth which is necessary for the well-being of that estate which was instituted by Him in Paradise, and has been consecrated by Christ. And (to those who pray for it) grace is given by Him to keep that vow.

In like manner the Episcopate, Priesthood, and Diaconate are holy states of life, instituted by God Himself, for His glory, and the good of His Church; and they who are admitted to those holy states may expect grace from Him to help them to keep the Vows which they take at their admission to them; just as all baptized persons may expect God's grace, if they pray for it, to keep the vows they made when they were admitted into Christ's Church by the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, instituted by Him. But these things cannot be rightly predicated concerning a Vow of Celibacy. As we have seen, Celibacy is not a state appointed to any one by command of God; and to impose on any one a Vow of celibacy, and to take a Vow of perpetual celibacy, in early life, is repugnant to His Will and Word.

(5.) But it does not follow as a necessary consequence that, because a Vow ought not to have been imposed or taken, it ought not to be kept.

If indeed it be a Vow to *do what is evil*, or may prove to be evil, like the vow of Micah's mother to make a molten image (Judges xvii. 3), or like the vow of David to kill Nabal (1 Sam. xxv. 22), or like the promise of Solomon not to deny his mother anything that she might ask (1 Kings ii. 19—25), or like the vow of the Israelitish women in Egypt to burn incense to the queen of heaven (Jer. xliv. 25), or like the oath of Herod to give the daughter of Herodias whatever she might desire (Matt. xiv. 7—8), or of the Jews to kill Paul (Acts xxiii. 12—15), or in later days in our own

country the vow of the Countess of Shrewsbury to answer no questions put to her in the Star Chamber;[1] or like the Solemn League and Covenant which the English Parliament, at the Restoration, in the Act of Uniformity, required men to abjure—in such cases the vow ought never to have been made, and ought not to be kept. "Dissolve vinculum iniquitatis," "Rei illicitæ nulla obligatio," are sound maxims.

But though a Vow of Celibacy is a rash thing, *celibacy itself* is not an evil thing, it is rather represented in Scripture as a good thing; though there may have been sin in taking the Vow of Celibacy, still, if it has been taken, ought it not to be kept? And to apply this to the cases in point, Ought a Vow of Celibacy, taken in an English Sisterhood, as now constituted, to be regarded as of perpetual obligation?

This is a difficult question, and depends much on the circumstances of the case.

If the vow has been made, according to the canons of the Ancient Church,[2] that is to say in the presence, *not* of a *Priest*, but of *the Bishop of the Diocese*, and with his full knowledge and sanction, and after careful examination by him, and with solemn previous warning of the consequences of breaking it; and *if*, according to the canons of the Church, the person taking the Vow has been carefully shielded against temptations to break it, by religious privacy and seclusion, then the obligation to keep it seems to become more stringent.

But if these rules of the ancient Church have not been observed, then, in the words of St. Basil, the fault of the breach is not so much with the breaker of the vow, as with the breakers[3] of the laws of the Church who have imposed the vow.

[1] See the case which gave rise to the excellent speech of Bishop Andrewes "concerning Vows," in his Opuscula, p. 79; he lays down as an axiom, p. 85, "Non debet voveri Deo, quod displicet Deo; quod sibi persolvi non vult, voveri Deus non vult."

[2] See above, p. 273.

[3] See above, p. 272. And in a similar tone the Emperor Leo, in Theodos. Novell. 8, "Neque enim sacrilega judicanda est, quæ se hoc ante noluisse, aut certè non posse complere, appetiti conjugii honestate prodiderit."

But as it seems to me (I speak with great diffidence) no general rule can be given; but each case must be considered by itself; and the question ought not to be determined by the person or persons principally concerned, who may be swayed by private bias, but by their Spiritual Superior, who would, I suppose, be guided in his decision by the judicious words of Bishop Sanderson,[4] "An Oath cannot be remitted without the consent of all parties; but the case of a *Vow* is not precisely the same as that of an Oath. In a *Vow,* since it is made to *God* alone, some liberty may perhaps be granted to the person who has taken it, of *changing* the same into another which may be *evidently better,* and more acceptable unto God, there being nothing in this change that is injurious to a third person."

But it will be safer to refer the matter to a wise, learned, and holy spiritual guide; and in no case ought a Vow, however rash, to be loosed by dispensation, without penitential sorrow and humiliation on the part of the person who has taken it.

Heartily wishing you success in your endeavours on behalf of the Sisterhoods of the Church of England,

I am, my dear Sir George,

Yours very sincerely,

C. Lincoln.

Riseholme, Lincoln.
June 1st, 1878.

P.S.—Since this letter was written some remarks have been made upon it in a pamphlet entitled, "Are Vows of Celibacy in early life inconsistent with the Word of God?" by a person whose name cannot be mentioned by me without feelings of respect—the Rev. Canon Carter, Rector of Clewer.

I do not find anything in those remarks to induce me to

[4] De Obligatione Juramenti, Prælect. vii. 5. Some directions as to the dispensation of Laws may be seen in Bishop Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium,* book iii. chap. vi.

make any alterations in my letter. Canon Carter seems to suppose that the widows mentioned in 1 Tim. v. 9 were alms-women, and that St. Paul's directions "evidently refer to the widow's pecuniary support, which is thus shown to be the main object in view" (p. 10). He does not indeed deny that she was bound to render service to the Church.

But it seems to me to be clear, from the context, that St. Paul is speaking of reception of widows by the Church after a vow of self-dedication to its service. His words to the Bishop of Ephesus, St. Timothy, are (1 Tim. v. 9): "Let not a widow be taken into the number (let her not be enrolled, *μὴ καταλεγέσθω*), under threescore years old." . . . . And what follows? "But younger widows refuse, for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they desire to marry (*γαμεῖν θέλουσι*), having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith," or plighted troth to Christ—"I will, therefore, that younger women marry." Evidently the elder widows (not under threescore) are contrasted with the younger. It is a question of age. The elder (not under sixty years of age) may be placed on the roll of the Church, and may be permitted to make a vow of permanent self-dedication. And why? because, on account of their age, they would *not* be like the *younger*, "who wish to marry," and break their vow of celibacy, and incur censure as untrue to Christ; and who, therefore, ought *not* to be admitted to take a vow of perpetual celibacy.

If it had been a question of the enrolment of alms-women by the Church, the Marriage of such women would not have been objectionable, but rather have been desirable, inasmuch as the burden of maintaining them would have been transferred from the Church to their husbands.

I therefore still adhere to my opinion, and agree with the best commentators (such as S. Jerome, S. Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and others quoted by Cornelius à Lapide; and with Chemnitius, Examen Concil. Trident. Sess. viii. de Cœlibatu, cap. ix.), that St. Paul is speaking of an enrolment of a widow in the service of the Church by a vow of celibacy; see above, pp. 269, 270.

I also argue (with the best expositors) that, if St. Paul would not have allowed a widow to be received by the Church with a vow of celibacy, under sixty years of age, he would not have sanctioned the reception of women "in early age" by a vow of celibacy, which Canon Carter approves, and affirms to be agreeable to God's Word.

Mr. Carter disclaims any wish to *impose* vows of celibacy (p. 4); he disapproves such a proceeding. But may I be allowed to ask, whether there is not something like a *moral pressure* and *coercion* exercised on the minds of the Sisters in some Sisterhoods, by eulogizing celibacy as a far higher spiritual state than marriage, and by disparaging marriage in comparison with it, and by representing a Sister who has married as having fallen from a higher state to a lower condition, and as almost under a ban?

Canon Carter also contends that a dedication contemplated by a young woman was in fact regarded in ancient times as *tantamount to a vow* (p. 18); and again (p. 24) he says, that "the dedication to a state of celibacy, whether expressed or *implied*, or however expressed, was regarded as *tantamount to a vow*."

He considers the *purpose* of celibacy as equivalent to a *vow*. I cannot agree with him in this. A young woman of ardent temperament, after hearing a stirring address from some eloquent preacher speaking of the "higher life," and dwelling on the merit of celibacy, may not unnaturally feel a desire, and entertain a design, of a single life. But is this "tantamount to a vow"? A vow is a very solemn thing; it is an act of worship of God; and when it has been made, it cannot lightly be unmade.

Holy Scripture says (Num. xxx. 3), "If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth." And again (Deut. xxiii. 21—23), "When thou shalt vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform." And therefore the wise man says (Eccl. v. 4, 5), "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no

pleasure in fools; pay that which thou hast vowed. Better it is that thou shouldst not vow, than that thou shouldst vow and not pay."

But an *intention* is a very different thing. It may be even right to alter it under a change of circumstances; and therefore, in words quoted above (p. 270), St. Cyprian distinguishes between a vow of celibacy and a purpose of single life. A young woman may entertain a desire, and form a design, of celibacy, under certain circumstances. But are the desire and the design, under those circumstances, to be regarded as having irrevocably fixed her condition for the future, and as having indissolubly rivetted her in celibacy for the rest of her life, however her circumstances may change, which are beyond her cognizance and control, and are known only to God, and which are in His hands? Would not this be to say that she has been arrogating to herself His attributes? And if under a change of circumstances, which are God's dealings with her, she modifies her desires, and shapes afresh her designs, is she to be regarded as *guilty of the sin of breaking a vow*, and as having incurred the penalties which Holy Scripture pronounces against those who commit that sin? Surely this would be a hard saying; and it is much to be wished that the excellent Author of the pamphlet before us may be induced to reconsider it.

ON ENGLISH CATHEDRALS.

In the year 1873 the Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral were printed by me (see below, p. 302).

That Code, called "Novum Registrum," is of great value and interest, inasmuch as Lincoln Cathedral is one of the best existing types of the English Cathedrals of the *old foundation*, and, inasmuch as the Code of Statutes remains unaltered to the present day. The following is the preface to this first printed edition.

Christophorus, divina permissione Episcopus Lincolniensis, dilectis in Christo, Decano, Præcentori, Cancellario, Subdecano, Archidiaconis, Canonicis, et Vicariis Ecclesiæ beatæ Virginis Mariæ Lincolniensis, salutem, gratiam, et benedictionem.

Damus vobis in manus Statuta Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis, nunc primum in lucem edita. Ut ea typis excudenda arbitraremur, variæ nos impulerunt rationes. Cum primum in istius Ecclesiæ consortium asciti sumus, in qua sanctissimis pietatis et caritatis nexibus in unum corpus consociamur, solenni sponsione professi sumus, nos ea quæ in hoc libro continentur pro virili parte fideliter observaturos, et aliis observanda procuraturos. Cui quidem pollicitationi satisfieri nequit, nisi quæ in hoc volumine comprehensa sunt, luculenter perspecta et explorata habeamus.

Multa sane in eo reperiri non diffetemur, quæ vel annorum decursu in desuetudinem abierunt, vel Reipublicæ legibus abrogata sunt, vel puriore fide et cultu divino illucescente evanuerunt. Ad hæc opere exequenda neminem obligari satis per se liquet.

Sed his, uti par est, prætermissis, plurima sane alia in oc legum nostrarum Codice supersunt, quæ sancte et

sapienter a majoribus nostris provisa, et legitima auctoritate stabilita, et unanimi consensu approbata, firma manent et inconcussa. Nemo, ut opinor, infitiabitur, hæc ab omnibus perpendi et observari debere, qui, in Ecclesiæ nostræ societatem recepti, sese jura ejus et laudabiles consuetudines tuituros esse fidem dederunt. Hæc igitur ut nobis universis innotescant magnopere est expetendum.

Accessit alia res non levis momenti, propter quam institutorum nostrorum notitiam latius divulgari cuperemus. Neminem fere latet, in hisce præsertim temporibus, rerum novarum studiosis, non paucos reperiri, qui ultro ad Ecclesias Angliæ Cathedrales refingendas et reformandas mira alacritate advolant, et qui hoc tam grande et tam arduum propositum adoriuntur tanquam rem extemporanea quadam facilitate et tumultuaria opera profligandam; et ne levi quidem cognitione argumenti, quod adeo prompte tractaturi sunt, imbuti et præparati.

Quorum quidem præfervidis ingeniis ut aliquod temperamentum adhibeamus, et ut remoram quandam atque sufflamen præproperæ eorum festinationi admoveamus, pristinam Ecclesiæ nostræ Lincolniensis imaginem oculis et animis hominum repræsentandam censuimus, quæ per octingentos jam fere annos inter splendidissima Angliæ lumina summa cum laude inclaruit, et omnium bonorum venerationem in se conciliavit. Id quoque faciendum hoc fine arbitrabamur, ut alii multi, qui Ecclesiam nostram debita pietate et reverentia prosequuntur, nova vetustis prudenter accommodantes et suaviter attemperantes, eam majore vigore corroborare, ampliore forma dilatare, et venustiore gratia illustrare, callerent. Nos etiam ipsi, filii in Christo dilecti, qui in unam Christi familiam arctissimis amoris vinculis congregamur, et qui Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis honorem, splendorem, unitatem, efficacitatem, tanquam nobilissimam et sanctissimam hæreditatem nobis ab antecessoribus nostris concreditam accepimus, non ut pigra eam socordia squalere sinamus, vel prodiga effusione dilapidari, sed ut assiduo labore et indefessa vigilantia excolamus et amplificemus, si in leges nostras, in hoc libro promulgatas, tanquam in vivum

quoddam speculum attenti intuemur, nosmet ipsos amplissimis facultatibus præditos et instructos recognoscemus, ad ea quæ in nostris institutis caduca sint instauranda, et ad ea quæ lapsa sint erigenda; ad manca supplenda, ad erronea emendanda, ad mutila resarcienda, ad obscura illustranda, ad debilia confirmanda, ad angusta expandenda et evolvenda; denique ad cætera, quibus opus sit, nostris ipsorum manibus sponte et libere perficienda.

Quo quidem proposito quid excogitari potest gloriosius, quid honorabilius, quid religiosius? Macti igitur, viri egregii; ad hoc opus nobilissimum nosmet ipsos accingamus, et Deum Optimum Maximum enixe apprecemur, ut conatibus nostris in honorem Ejus et Ecclesiæ emolumentum, uti speramus, redundaturis faveat, obsecundet, et opituletur.

Antecessorum nostrorum vestigiis insistentes Visitationem Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis habituri, Deo annuente, et vobis adjuvantibus, mensis Aprilis proxime insequentis die XXIX^no^, hunc interea librum vobis sedulo versandum commendamus, ut ad normam institutionum a patribus nostris sancitarum consilia nostra dirigamus et conformemus, et ut ea, quæ a nobis una congregatis deliberatione seria maturata fuerint, concordi affectu exequamur.

Restat ut gratias ex animo agamus fraternitatis vestræ viris primariis, Decano, et Canonicis residentiariis, qui Codicum duorum manuscriptorum usum benevole nobiscum communicaverunt, cum nostro Novi Registri et Laudi Willielmi Alnwick antecessoris nostri exemplari conferendorum; et viris ornatissimis Edmundo Venables, Præcentori Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis, et Edwardo White Benson, Cancellario; quorum ille duorum istorum codicum collationem, nostro rogatu, humanissime et accuratissime confecit, et uterque in schedis typographicis recensendis et emendandis operam suam nobis subministraverunt. Valete dilecti in Domino.

Dabamus Riseholmiæ, in Festo S. Matthiæ Apostoli, XXIV^to^ die mensis Februarii, A.S. MDCCCLXXIII., et consecrationis nostræ anniversario quarto.

NOVI REGISTRI CONSPECTUS.

PAGINA

Præfatio WILLIELMI ALNWICK, Episcopi Lincolniensis . . . 1
Occasio NOVI REGISTRI . . . . . ib.
Canonici convocantur mandato Episcopi, per Decanum et Capitulum ib.
Novum Registrum quare compositum 2
Ad solum Novum Registrum recurrendum pro dubiis in Ecclesia Lincolniensi decidendis . . . . . ib.
Tempus compositionis Novi Registri, A.D. 1440, post Festum Sancti Michaelis . . . . . ib.
Divisio Novi Registri in quinque partes 3
De primaria fundatione Ecclesiæ Lincolniensis . . . . ib.
Remigius Episcopus, A.D. 1067—1094: Rothomagensis Ecclesia . ib.
Literæ Willielmi Primi Regis . . . . . ib.
Constitutio Ecclesiæ; post Episcopum tresdecem sunt dignitates . ib.

DE EPISCOPO 4
Installatio Episcopi . . . . . ib.
Juramentum . . . . . ib.
De residentia Episcopi 5
Deductio Episcopi in Ecclesia; pulsatio campanarum . . . ib.
Executio officii per Episcopum in Ecclesia . . . . . ib.
De visitatione Episcopi personali 6
Vel per Commissarium, qui debet esse Canonicus 7
De correctione delatorum Episcopo in visitatione Capituli . . ib.
Correctiones per Episcopum extra Visitationem . . . . ib.
Correctio Vicariorum 8

DE DECANO . . . . . ib.
Decanus principalior persona post Episcopum . . . . . ib.
Decani electio . . . . . ib.
Decanus præsentatur Episcopo confirmandus . . . . . ib.
Decani installatio . . . . . ib.
Juramentum 9
Residentia Decani . . . . . ib.
Juramentum obedientiæ Decano per Canonicos et inferiores præstandum 9, 10
Decanus jurat Episcopo obedientiam 10
Officium et jurisdictio Decani . . . . . ib.
De divinis officiis Decano incumbentibus, absente Episcopo . . 11
Dies pascendi per Decanum . . . . . ib.
Decano absente, sublimior persona celebrat . . . . . ib.
Decani ministeria sacra in Ecclesia, absente Episcopo . . 11, 12
Missa matutinalis 12
Decanus visitat Canonicos infirmos . . . . . ib.
Convocat Canonicos residentiarios, et non residentiarios, consensu Capituli . . . . . ib.
Decani visitatio triennalis 13

PAGINA

In corrigendis detectorum Episcopo totum Capitulum convocatur . 14
Decanus corrigit chorum et Ecclesiæ ministros . . . . . ib.
Duratio visitationis Decani . . . . . ib.
Absentiam et negligentiam Decani supplet Capitulum in correctionibus 15
In causis contra Canonicos Decanus et Capitulum communiter procedunt . . . . . ib.
Decanus non visitat præbendas in civitate . . . . . ib.
Jurisdictio Decani et Capituli in præbendas . . . . . ib.
Insigniis Episcopalibus non utitur Decanus . . . . . ib.
Jurisdictio, sede vacante 16
Decanus admittit Vicarios Chorales Capitulo consentiente . . 17
Quod Decanus facere dicitur, intelligenda sunt de Decano cum Capitulo . . . . . ib.
Declaratio verborum "Judicio Capituli" 18
Reverentia Decano facienda 19
Residentes devillare vel minuere volentes licentiam petant a Decano ib.
Episcopo præsente, Decanus non expectatur . . . . . ib.
Episcopus Ecclesiæ suæ caput, cui debetur reverentia a Decano . 20
Residentiarii ne conveniantur coram Episcopo extra Domum Capitularem . . . . . ib.
De Decano præbendato . . . . . ib.
Decanus jurisdictionem communem sibi soli ne usurpet . . 20, 21
Decanus preces inceptas re-incipere ne attemptet 21
De clavibus sigilli communis . . . . . ib.
Cauda capæ Decani non portatur per sequentem se extra clausum, nec in præsentia Episcopi 22

De officio et potestate PRÆCENTORIS . . . . . ib.
Tabula cantûs . . . . . ib.
Choristæ et Magister cantûs et grammaticæ præsentantur per Præcentorem . . . . . ib.
Pueros in choro corrigit 23
Cantûs Magistrum in civitate, et in comitatu præficiat . . . ib.
Libros cantuum reficit . . . . . ib.
Juramentum de residentia . . . . . ib.

De officio et potestate CANCELLARII . . . . . ib.
Scholas Theologiæ regit . . . . . ib.
In eis legit . . . . . ib.
Tabulam de Lectionibus, Missis, Epistolis, Evangeliis componit . ib.
Lectiones audit . . . . . ib.
Sigillum Capituli custodit . . . . . ib.
Legenda in Capitulo legit . . . . . ib.
Libros Theologiæ capitulares custodit, et annuatim invisit, et Capitulo ostendit . . . . . ib.
Registrum librorum conficit 24
Scholas Grammaticæ confert . . . . . ib.

PAGINA

Libros legendarum corrigit 24
Sermones ad populum prædicantur per Cancellarium . . . ib.
Sermones in Latino, et in Anglicis . . . . . ib.
Quibus diebus prædicare debet . . . . . ib.
Prædicantes in Dominicis pascuntur per celebrantem . . . ib.
Examinatio pro Sacris Ordinibus, et admittendorum ad Vicarias, pertinet ad Cancellarium . . . . . ib.
Residentia Cancellarii . . . . . ib.

De officio THESAURARII . . . . . ib.
Reliquias, libros divino officio deputatos, vasa, vestimenta, ornamenta Ecclesiæ custodit . . . . . ib.
Inventaria bonorum Ecclesiæ conficit 25
Sacristam præsentat Decano et Capitulo . . . . . ib.
De campanis, cereis, præcipue Paschalibus, vino, aqua, hostiis, candelis, manutergiis, sale, incenso, carbonibus, nattis, per Thesaurarium procurandis . . . . . ib.
Lotrix; cerei ante et super altare 26
"Liber Niger" 27
Reparatio vestimentorum . . . . . ib.
Residentia Thesaurarii . . . . . ib.

De officio, præeminentia, juramento, et censu octo ARCHIDIACONORUM ib.
Archidiaconi præstant juramentum obedientiæ Episcopo . . . ib.
Archidiaconus Lincolniensis . . . . . ib.

De officio SUBDECANI 28
De residentia Subdecani . . . . . ib.
Quinquaginta et sex Canonici cum Capite suo Corpus et CAPITULUM constituunt . . . . . ib.
Ordo dignitatum, et Canonicorum sive Præbendariorum, cum Psalmis ascriptis et taxatione . . . . . ib.
Primo stallus Decani in introitu chori . . . . . ib.
Stalli Archidiaconorum 29
Stallus Subdecani . . . . . ib.
Stallus Cancellarii juxta sedem Episcopalem . . . . . ib.
Stallus Archidiaconi Oxoniensis . . . . . ib.
Præbendarum ordo ex dextra parte chori, cum Psalmis ascriptis . ib
Dignitatum ordo ex sinistra parte chori 30
Primo stallus Præcentoris . . . . . ib.
Stalli Archidiaconorum . . . . . ib.
Stallus Thesaurarii . . . . . ib.

SECUNDA PARTICULA Novi Registri; de Canonicorum ingressu . 32
Investitura Canonicorum ab Episcopo collatorum . . . . ib.
Canonicus inducitur in chorum, et installatur . . . . . ib.
Preces, Psalmi quotidie dicendi; reducitur in Capitulum . . . ib.
Locus ei in Capitulo assignatur . . . . . ib.
Juramentum . . . . . ib.

PAGINA

"LAUDUM" Willielmi Alnwick, Episcopi Lincoln. observandum . 32
In processionibus ordo Canonicorum 33
Installatio Archidiaconorum non præbendatorum . . . . ib.
Procurator Canonici quomodo investiendus . . . . . ib.
Juramentum Canonicorum 34
De vino dando Decano et Canonicis per installandos . . . ib.
De Vicario substituendo per Canonicum non residentem . . . 35
Officia et stipendia Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Canonici servitio Episcopi insistentes non solvunt septimam . . ib.
Jurisdictio Canonicorum in præbendis suis extra civitatem Lincolniensem; causæ exceptæ; ab Archidiaconorum et Episcopi potestate libera 35, 36
Visitatio Episcopi reservatur 36
De convocatione omnium Canonicorum 39
Recitatio Psalmorum quotidiana . . . . . ib.
Quilibet Canonicus præbendatus deserviat in Ecclesia per hebdomadam . . . . . ib.
In Dominica hebdomadæ suæ pascere tenetur . . . . . ib.

PARTICULA TERTIA de Canonicorum progressu, residentia, et ordine ministrandi 39
De residentia primaria majori canonicali; quando et quomodo intrabunt, quando possunt abesse; quæ onera eis incumbunt; et quid sunt percepturi 40
Residentia major, 34 septimanarum et 4 dierum . . . . . ib.
De protestatione residentiæ . . . . . ib.
Assignatio hospitii . . . . . ib.
Fractio panis, potûs ministratio . . . . . ib.
Canonicis horis interesse tenetur quotidie 41
Minutus residens, petita licentia minuendi, abesse potest per unum diem . . . . . ib.
In Ecclesia residere, est Ecclesiæ in divinis officiis deservire . . ib.
Introitus in residentiam . . . . . ib.
De celebrantibus in cursu . . . . . ib.
Propria septimana trahit ad se cursum . . . . . ib.
Hebdomadarius debet præmuniri 42
Quinam sint ab eo in Dominica pascendi . . . . . ib.
Anniversaria, in quibus Decanus celebrat et pascit . . . . ib.
Hebdomadarius etiam absens pascit . . . . . ib.
Prioritas in Ecclesia . . . . . ib.
Pastus duplicium . . . . . ib.
Pastus in semiduplicibus 43
LAUDUM Willielmi Alnwick. Episcopi Lincolniensis . . . ib.
Quilibet Canonicus residens habet Capellanum commensalem, qui cum ipso chorum frequentat horis nocturnis et diurnis . . ib.
Officia divina, diurna et nocturna, a Canonicis assidue frequentanda; cum humilitate et devotione 44
Colloquia in Ecclesia ne fiant . . . . . ib.

PAGINA

Domus Dei Domus Orationum 44
Inclinationes capitis; conversiones . . . . . ib.
Habitus Canonicorum . . . . . ib.
Tonsura . . . . . ib.
De ordine processionis 45
Sæcularis habitus in Ecclesia tempore divini officii a Canonicis non portandus . . . . . ib.
Capæ nigræ . . . . . ib.
Vesperæ sine intervallo cum completorio dicendæ . . . . . ib.
Collatio in Quadragesima . . . . . ib.
Nullus nisi Canonicus celebret in majori altari, quibusdam exceptis . 46
Celebrans matutinis debet interesse . . . . . ib.
Anniversaria celebrant intabulati . . . . . ib.
Reverentia altaris . . . . . ib.
De introitu Canonicorum in chorum ad matutinas . . . . . ib.
Canonici se inclinent . . . . . ib.
Introitus ad vesperas 47
Modus standi in choro . . . . . ib.
Conversio ad altare . . . . . ib.
Signum crucis . . . . . ib.
Genuflexio . . . . . ib.
Prostratio in ferialibus . . . . . ib.
De Capitulis, in singulis Sabbatis, convocandis 48
Hebdomadarii scribuntur in tabula . . . . . ib.
Convocatio residentiariorum . . . . . ib.
Absentes non possunt infringere actus residentiariorum; "minutio aut solatium" . . . . . ib.
Pauci non statuunt 49
De dispensationibus non cuiquam residentiariorum faciendis ad jura residentiæ capienda licet absens fuerit . . . . . ib.
Capituli negotia ordinate tractentur . . . . . ib.
In Capitulum extranei ne intrent . . . . . ib.
Registrum Capituli 50
Custodia clavium sigilli . . . . . ib.
Canonici singuli contribuunt in causis Capituli . . . . . ib.
Pensiones et feoda conceduntur per Capitulum . . . . . ib.
Canonici residentes, in majori et in minori, quid sunt percepturi . 51
Communa duplex hebdomadario datur . . . . . ib.
Festum translationis Sancti Hugonis, Lincolniensis Episcopi . . ib.
Distributio quarta feria Pentecostes . . . . . ib.
Vina, obitus, et alia . . . . . ib.
Collationes beneficiorum ad Decanum et Capitulum spectantium per Capitulum fiunt 52
De firmis canonicalibus 53
Decanus cum Præposito maneria Ecclesiæ visitat . . . . . ib.
Hospitia Canonicorum infra clausum visitent Decanus (vel, Decano absente, Præcentor) et Cancellarius . . . . . ib.
De minori residentia 54

PAGINA

Continue vel interpolate per septendecim hebdomadas immunitas residentium in minori 54

Quarta Pars 55
De Vicariis Canonicorum . . . . . ib.
De Canonico infirmo . . . . . ib.
Decanus visitat . . . . . ib.
Unctio extrema . . . . . ib.
Exequiæ Canonici 56
Funus in Ecclesia . . . . . ib.
Psalmi, vigiliæ . . . . . ib.
Missa . . . . . ib.
Sepultura . . . . . ib.
Testamentum . . . . . ib.
Canonicus defunctus percipit fructus per annum . . . . . ib.
Usus domorum præbendæ per annum . . . . . ib.
Instauramentum defuncti, caulæ, horrea, grangiæ, pascua, boves, averia, warrectum, nemora, implementa, fimus 57
De Canonico religionem ingrediente . . . . . ib.
De Canonico in Episcopum electo . . . . . ib.
Missæ; Psalteria 58

Quinta Pars 59
De Vicariis, Cantariarum Capellanis . . . . . ib.
Juramentum Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Infra annum sciat corde tenus Psalmos . . . . . ib.
De pœna Canonici non præsentantis Vicarium infra tempus . . ib.
Stipendia Vicariorum 60
Communa Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Præpositi Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Majores horæ, et minores . . . . . ib.
De absentia Vicariorum 61
Minutio non excusat . . . . . ib.
Præpositi computus . . . . . ib.
Communa Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Missæ pro Canonicis defunctis . . . . . ib.
Habitus et tonsura Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Ingressus in chorum; incessus; discursus ne fiant . . . . . ib.
Castitas . . . . . ib.
Incontinentiæ pœna . . . . . ib
In vias non debent incedere 63
Capitulum ingrediantur ad audiendas lectiones, et in die Sabbati instructionem et correctionem recepturi . . . . . ib.
Rixæ . . . . . ib.
Processiones . . . . . ib.
Succentor ordinat processiones . . . . . ib.
De modo Psalmos cantandi . . . . . ib.
Vicarii habent aulam communem 64

PAGINA

Colloquia cum suspectis ne habeant; tabernas ne frequentent . . 64
Vicarii invitantur ad refectionem a Canonicis . . . . . ib.
Vicarius post residentiam Canonici sui quando desinit . . . ib.
Altare Sancti Petri . . . . . ib.
De Præposito annuo 65
Sit ad firmarios modestus . . . . . ib.
Ecclesias appropriatas circumeat . . . . . ib.
De Sacrista, Thesaurarii ministro . . . . . ib.
De Magistris et Custodibus fabricæ 66
Defectus Ecclesiæ et fenestrarum reparant; contra pluviarum, nivum, columbarum injurias, et sordes, sedulo invigilant; campanilia, voltas, deambulatoria, gutteras scrutantur; nec liquari sinant plumbum, vel ligna securibus cædi supra voltas . . . ib.
Juramentum 67
Modus computandi . . . . . ib.
De fimo ejiciendo . . . . . ib.
Refrigescit charitas, cessat devotio . . . . . ib.
Indulgentiæ pro fabrica publicandæ . . . . . ib.
Aliæ quæstiones per Quadragesimam suspensæ 68
Quid publicent nuntii fabricæ . . . . . ib.
De officio Succentoris . . . . . ib.
De officio Vicecancellarii . . . . . ib.
Defectus ministrantium notant . . . . . ib.
Absentibus alios substituunt . . . . . ib.
De cantariarum presbyteris . . . . . ib.
Missæ alta voce non dicantur 69
Ignoti presbyteri ne permittantur celebrare . . . . . ib.
Collationes cantariarum . . . . . ib.
Tempus celebrationum Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
De pauperibus clericis chori 70
De choristis . . . . . ib.
Choristæ, admissi per Præcentorem, simul vivant, habeant Canonicum magistrum; et senescallum; a Præcentore præsentandi; de Lincolniensi Diœcesi præferendi; inter spatiandum habeant ducem et custodem . . . . . ib.
Ecclesiæ pollutæ reconciliatio 71
In præsentia Regis, Canonici possunt celebrare, etiam si nocte præcedente matutinis non interfuerint . . . . . ib.

Statuta Vicariorum 73
Quilibet Canonicus præsentabit Vicarium Decano, qui examinatur an sciat legere et cantare; quid addiscat . . . . . ib.
Juramentum . . . . . ib.
Stipendium . . . . . ib.
Denarius diurnus 74
Perditiones Vicariorum . . . . . ib.
Horæ majores . . . . . ib.
Horæ minores . . . . . ib.

PAGINA

Præpositus Vicariorum 75
Gestus clericorum in choro . . . . . ib.
Inclinationes . . . . . ib.
Ingressus, modestia . . . . . ib.
Ne insolenter formas transiliant . . . . . ib.
Murmur ne fiat in choro 76
Modus standi et sedendi in choro . . . . . ib.
Prostratio . . . . . ib.
Conversio ad altare 77
Conversio ad Evangelium . . . . . ib.
Signatio crucis . . . . . ib.

Compositio inter Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem et Decanum, sede vacante, A.D. 1361 78

Ecclesiæ appropriatæ de Holbech, Mumby, et Woburne, A.D. 1334 . ib.

Indentura pro reditibus Willielmi Dalderby in Newport, A.D. 1417 . ib.

Laudum Willielmi Alnwick, Episcopi Lincolniensis, A.D. 1439 . 81
Dissentio orta inter Decanum, Johannem Macworth, et Capitulum . ib.
Compromissum Capituli . . . . . ib.
Quæstiones litis adversus Decanum, per Capitulum . . . 82—87
Promissio Capituli de ratâ habendâ sententiâ Episcopi . . 88—90
Compromissum Decani 90
Quæstiones litis per Decanum . . . . . ib.
Juramentum Decani de Laudo Episcopi observando . . . 94
Willielmus Episcopus, corporis capitularis caput, compromissa Capituli et Decani accipit; convocat Canonicos, et consensu Canonicorum ad Laudum (i. e. *sentence*) promulgandum procedit . 95
Episcopus Lincolniensis Ecclesiæ Ordinarius 96
Decanus vice duorum fungitur . . . . . ib.
Capitulum, Decano absente, feoda concedit 97
Capitulum super levibus absente Decano statuit . . . . ib.
Residentiarius Canonicus Capellanum habere debet . . . . ib.
Vicarius non potest esse Capellanus . . . . . ib.
Cantarias vacantes quis confert . . . . . ib.
Donata vel legata ad certum usum ne transferantur ad alium . 98
Pannus Canonicis liberatus pro pauperibus clericis non alienandus . ib.
Canonicus non admittitur in minorem residentiam, nisi post triennium in majore . . . . . ib.
Reparationes hospitiorum quando per Canonicos faciendæ . . . 100
Stipendia ministrorum primo solvantur . . . . . ib.
Detecta in visitatione Episcopali corrigantur per Decanum et Capitulum . . . . . ib.
Dispensationes residentiariis ne fiant ut absentes sint . . . ib.
Bona, i.e. calices, vestimenta, libri, jocalia, vasa aurea et argentea segniter nimis conservantur 101
Thesaurarii munus . . . . . ib.

PAGINA

Inventaria facienda 101
Pastus chori per Decanum in festis principalibus 102
Et in obitibus Regum et Episcoporum . . . . . ib.
Dignitates etiam absentes pascere debent certis festis . . . ib.
Præbendatus Decanus, non residentiam faciens, ut Præbendarius (quamvis resideat ut Decanus) habeat Vicarium . . . 103
Ubi emolumentum, ibi onus . . . . . ib.
Decani liberi a celebrando et pascendo in cursu . . . . ib.
Cognitio causarum a Decano simul cum Capitulo facienda . . 104
Portæ clausi claudantur horis debitis . . . . . ib.
Quædam facit Decanus solus absque Capitulo . . . . . ib.
Pulsatio campanarum quando cessabit 105
In festis celebrantes tabulantur per Vicecancellarium . . . 106
Vicariorum correctio et expulsio . . . . . ib.
Annullatio ordinationum Willielmi Gray . . . . . ib.
Custodia clavium sigilli communis . . . . . ib.
Reditus fabricæ et expensæ 108
Pauperes clerici quid scire debent . . . . . ib.
Juramentum de Laudo Episcopi observando 109
Laudi observatio 110
Protestatio Episcopi Laudatoris 111
Laudum publicatur 23 Jun. 1439 . . . . . ib.
Testis 112

Address to the Dean and Chapter and other members of the Capitular body, at the Visitation of Lincoln Cathedral.
(*April* 29, 1873.)

My Reverend and Lay Brethren, Members of this Cathedral Church of St. Mary, Lincoln,—

A question may be asked, Why, after a lapse of many years, in which no Visitation of this Cathedral Church has been held, you have been called together for that purpose to-day?

This is a reasonable inquiry. Let me endeavour to answer it. Our Code of Statutes,[1] which was framed in the middle of the fifteenth century,[2] and embodies the laws and customs of the Cathedral from its foundation at the close of the eleventh century, contemplates that such Visitations will be held by the Bishop from time to time.[3] That Code of Statutes itself was due to such a Visitation.[4]

One of the most eminent Bishops of Lincoln, Robert

[1] Called the "Novum Registrum," which has been printed for the first time in the present year. Some short extracts from it may be seen in Wilkins' "Concilia," i. 532—538, which show that Lincoln was a pattern to other Cathedrals, even in Scotland, e. g. Moray.

[2] Soon after Michaelmas. A.D. 1440. See "Novum Registrum," p. 1.

[3] "Novum Registrum" (dated at the Bishop's Manor at Nettleham, 29 June, 1439) pp. 1 and 6, where it is said that the Bishop may visit "Ecclesiam suam Cathedralem, decanum et capitulum ejusdem et personas quascunque habentes dignitates canonicatus, præbendas, personatus, cantariasque et officia in eâdem, quoties et quando voluerit" (Cp. "Laudum" Willielmi Alnwick, p. 100); and this is correctly stated among the answers of the Dean and Chapter, on April 13th, 1853, to the Cathedral Commissioners, in the following words ("Report," p. 261): "The Bishop is visitor of the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral, and of all persons having dignities, canonries, prebends, parsonages, chapteries, and other offices in the same, as often and when he shall think it expedient," and there "is no other interpreter of the Statutes than the Visitor."

[4] Ibid. p. 1. So was the "Laudum," see pp. 62 and 95.

Grossetête, in a letter written about A.D. 1240, says[5] that "a Bishop, who is not hindered by insuperable impediments, cannot, without peril to his own soul, omit the duty of holding Visitations, and, above all (he adds), ought he to visit the Chapter of his Cathedral Church."

Accordingly such Visitations have been held of this Cathedral by Bishops of Lincoln from time immemorial. A Visitation was held in this Chapter-house[6] by Robert Grossetête in 1246, by Bishop D'Alderby in 1300, by Bishop Burgwash in 1334,[7] by William Smyth (the founder of Brasenose College) in the spring of 1501,[8] and was continued by adjournments for a fortnight, and was renewed in the autumn of 1503; by Bishop William Barlow, by Commission in 1611, by Bishop Montaigne in 1618, by Bishop Barlow, acting by a Commission, in the year 1690, and by four Bishops of Lincoln in succession (three[9] of whom have left a name which will always be associated with the history of the provincial Synods of the Church of England, and the fourth[1] is not unworthy to be named with them),—Bishop Tenison in 1693, Bishop Gardiner in 1697, and again in 1703, Bishop Wake in 1706[2] and 1709, and in 1712, which was continued, by prorogation, from May 24th to the 10th July in that year, and again, by Commission, in 1715, and by Bishop Gibson 1718. A Visitation was held by Bishop Reynolds 1729, Bishop Thomas in 1748, and in 1751.

Whether the intermission of capitular Visitations since

[5] Roberti Grossetête, "Epistolæ, ed. Luard," pp. 371 and 375.

[6] Which was built about A.D. 1225, in the Episcopate of Hugh de Wells, certainly before 1235, when he died. Mr. Edmund Sharpe, "Lincoln Excursion," 1871, pp. 26 and 151; Cp. Dimock's History of Lincoln Cathedral in "Transactions of Lincoln Archit. Society for 1867," p. 199.

[7] See Cottonian MSS. Vitell. A. X. 4.

[8] This Visitation, which seems to have been conducted with much solemnity and magnificence, is described in the "Life of Bishop Smyth," by Churton, pp. 116—127, from Regist. Lincoln. f. 140—145.

[9] Bishops Tenison, Wake, and Gibson.

[1] Bishop Gardiner. His primary charge, or "Advice to the Clergy," 1697, is a very creditable record of him.

[2] When sundry Statutes and Orders were promulgated by the Bishop, with the consent of the Dean, dignitaries, and prebendaries of this Cathedral Church. The same was done in 1712.

that time may be reckoned among the causes of the spiritual calamities of our Church in the last century—on which we look back with sorrow—it is not necessary now to inquire; suffice it to say, that the circumstances of the present times imperatively demand a revival of a practice which is prescribed by our laws, and is commended by the example of our forefathers.

The question of the condition and prospects of our Cathedral Churches is forced upon our consideration by passing events. It would seem to be our duty to show to the world that we do not shrink from inquiry, and that we are united in a common desire to remove abuses in our system, to correct errors, to supply defects, and to improve, adorn, and consolidate these ancient sanctuaries of Almighty God, which are set apart for the continual work of prayer and praise, and for the encouragement of sound learning and religious education, and which shed glory on England and on Christendom.

In order that we may with God's help be able to do this work with well-advised judgment, we must endeavour to gain a clear insight into the constitution of our Cathedrals, and into the purposes for which they were founded, and for which they exist.

What do we mean by a Cathedral? How is it distinguished from the Parish Churches of a diocese? What duties does it discharge that are not performed by them? What are the reasons of its existence? What is the ideal of it?

To such questions as these various answers are given.

By some persons it is replied, that a Cathedral is a magnificent fabric, of deep historical and artistic interest to the literary student, the antiquary, the architect, and the sculptor. This is true. But many Parish Churches, especially in this Diocese, have almost equal claims to regard on these accounts.

Others would answer, that in Cathedrals the voice of Morning and Evening Prayer never ceases; and that a Cathedral is a school of Church music, and a model of liturgical order to a Diocese. But here again with thankfulness we may acknowledge that many of our Parish

churches may vie with our Cathedrals. Again, it may be said, that in our Cathedrals large congregations of devout worshippers are assembled, and derive great spiritual benefit from the piety, learning, and eloquence of Christian preachers. But the worshippers in some of our parish churches are more numerous than those who are gathered together in some of our Cathedrals; and the members of our capitular bodies will thankfully acknowledge, that their brethren of the parochial clergy receive the most cheering evidence of the good effects of their teaching in the church, because it is endeared to their people by the personal visits of the pastor, going from house to house through his parish, and especially by his spiritual ministrations at the bed of sickness and of death.

I do not advert to the opinion of some, that Cathedrals are to be regarded as offering rewards for work already done, and as quiet retirements and tranquil resting-places for learned leisure. This was the case formerly, when their endowments were unimpaired, and their resident members were numerous; but with their present reduced proportions it can hardly be realized now in any considerable degree.

On the whole, it may be affirmed, that the attributes we have now specified do indeed commend our Cathedrals[3] to affectionate reverence and gratitude; but that they are not so distinctively characteristic of them as to constitute their essence. Those attributes might still belong to our Cathedrals if they were changed into parish churches.

What then, we repeat, do we mean by a Cathedral? What are the ends which are specially attained by it? What are the functions it performs, which are not discharged by any other church in the diocese?

For an answer to this question we have not far to look. We find it supplied in our own Code of Statutes, which you

[3] Their claims in these respects have been stated with his usual eloquence by one who is among their brightest ornaments—the present Dean of Norwich, in his work entitled "The Principles of the Cathedral System:" London, 1870.

have in your hands, and which we have promised to obey, as far as we are able.[4]

First, we see there that in the Cathedral Church, as its name indicates, is the *cathedra*, or seat of the Bishop of the diocese. Lincoln Cathedral was (like the other eight English Cathedral Churches of the old foundation) a church of *secular* canons, and not of regulars or monks; and this preserved it from those disasters which altered the character and constitution of what are termed the "Conventual Cathedrals" of England.[5] And hence it is, that at this day the Cathedral Church of Lincoln stands in the first rank, as one of the noblest specimens of that glorious family of old English Cathedrals, which, whether we consider the wisdom of their founders, and the excellence of their laws, or the magnificence of their fabrics, are probably without a parallel in the Western or Eastern Church.

In the Cathedral Church was the seat of the Bishop; he held the chief place,[6] and exercised the principal authority there, in the regulation and ordering of its sacred services, in the administration of its laws and determination of controversies, and in the maintenance of its discipline, and in so governing the whole capitular body, that its beneficent influence was felt in every part of the diocese.

But the position of the Bishop was not one of arbitrary power. He was provided with a Council. The Chapter was the "Senatus Episcopi;"[7] and though he could administer

[4] I am well aware that the remarks in this Address concerning the true ideal of a Cathedral apply more to those like Lincoln, of the *old foundation*, than to the Cathedrals of the *new;* but I venture to think that much more might be gained by assimilating those of the new to the old than *vice versâ*. For example, why should not the "*honorary canons*" of the *new* be put on the same footing as the *prebendaries* of the *old*, as to votes in elections of the Bishop and of the Proctor in Convocation for the Cathedral?

[5] See the First Report of the Cathedral Commissioners, A.D. 1854, pp. 3—10; and Mr. Edward A. Freeman's learned and interesting Essay in Dean Howson's volume on "Cathedrals," pp. 138—165, London, 1872.

[6] See our "Novum Registrum," p. 4; and "Laudum," p. 95, line 18.

[7] Compare Bishop Stillingfleet's "Ecclesiastical Cases," vol. ii. p. 564, London, 1704.

existing laws by his own authority, yet he would not frame and promulge any new laws without the consent of that Council. Our digest of Statutes, which bears the name of a Bishop of Lincoln—William Alnwick—would not have had any practical effect, if it had not been put forth with that consent. And the "Laudum" or "Arbitrium" of the same Bishop, which settled the disputes between the Dean and the Chapter[8] (A.D. 1439) a little before the promulgation of the Statutes, derives its validity from his authority, exercised with the consent of his Capitular Council.

That Capitular Council, or Chapter, consisted of the Dean and the other twelve dignities, as they are called in that Code,[1] viz. the precentor, chancellor, treasurer (now no longer existing), sub-dean, and the archdeacons of the diocese (eight in number), and the other canons or prebendaries (as they were called) who are represented here to-day.

This numerous body, consisting of fifty-six persons, was the Constitutional Council of the Bishop. This body—and this body alone—is called in the Statutes "the Chapter of the Cathedral;"[2] and it was his duty to avail himself of its help, for joint consultation, especially on matters of doctrine and discipline.[3]

If we proceed to analyze the constituent elements of this capitular body, we recognize the wise policy of those who formed it.

Among the thirteen dignities, four[4] held the foremost places, and the position which they occupied and the duties

[8] The "Laudum" of Bishop Alnwick, now printed for the first time, is dated at Nettleham, near Lincoln, June 29, 1439, a year before the "Novum Registrum," or Digest of Statutes; see above, pp. 290—301.

[1] "Novum Registrum," p. 3.

[2] "Quinquaginta et sex Canonici Ecclesiæ beatæ Mariæ Lincolniensis cum capite suo corpus et capitulum constituunt, negotia Ecclesiæ et secreta tractant."—"Novum Registrum," p. 28.

[3] In the Statutes of the Cathedral of Salisbury (one of the Cathedrals of the old foundation, like Lincoln) the Chapter is called "Concilium Episcopi contra hæreses et schismata."

[4] A list of persons who have held them, may be seen in Le Nève's "Fasti Ecclesiæ," pp. 144—171, ed. London, 1716; and in Browne Willis, "English Cathedrals," vol. iii. 1—131, Lond., 1742.

allotted to them respectively are full of significance. It is worthy of remark, as a characteristic principle of these capitular dignities, that each of the persons who held them had distinct functions assigned to him; and in order that he might discharge them faithfully and assiduously, he was bound to reside eight months[5] in the year.

First among these dignities was the Dean.

He represents the priestly and pastoral office of the Church. Next to the Bishop he held the chief place in the ministrations of the Church. He had the cure of souls of all the members of the capitular body. He had archidiaconal jurisdiction in all the parishes annexed to the prebends of the Cathedral. He was the "Censor morum" of the whole body, and all its members promised obedience to him.

In some Cathedrals of the old foundation the Dean exercised archidiaconal jurisdiction[6] over the churches and parishes of the Cathedral city. This was not the case at Lincoln;[7] but he had the right of visiting the Chapter triennially, and of correcting abuses in it.

Next to the Dean in dignity was the Precentor. The position he holds in the Cathedral Church, and the duties annexed to his office, display the pious zeal of our founders and forefathers for the reverent celebration of the worship of God, and for the moral as well as musical training and ordering of the Christian Levites ministering in the sanctuary, and for the devout offering of the continual sacrifice of

[5] Thirty-four weeks and five days. "Registrum Novum," p. 9; "Laudum," p. 102. This order, which the Dean and Chapter were bound on oath to obey, could hardly be set aside by a bye-law of their own in 1596, by which each residentiary was allowed to be absent from the Cathedral 261 days in the year."—"Report of the Cathedral Commission," p. 254.

[6] As at Lichfield. Dugdale, iii. 243. See also "Cathedra' Commission Report," p. 6; and Appendix, pp. 7 and 26.

[7] Even in Bishop Grossetête's time (A.D. 1240) there was a "Rural Dean of *Christianity*" (Epist. p. 266), i.e. of the Cathedral precinct and city—a remarkable word, as showing that the neighbourhood of a Cathedral was regarded as a luminous spiritual Goshen, contrasted with the Egypt of *paganism*, properly so called, around it. The Rural Dean was subordinate to the Archdeacon of Lincoln.

prayer and praise, with all the appropriate accessories of sacred song and holy melody to His Divine Glory and Majesty.

But our founders and forefathers were wisely conscious that the exercise of the priestly and pastoral office, and the choral harmonies of liturgical services would be of little avail without the maintenance of sound doctrine animating and regulating the whole. Therefore next to the Dean and Precentor they placed the Chancellor. He was the theologian, the ecclesiastical professor and lecturer, the homilist, the school inspector, the grammarian, the librarian, and the secretary of the capitular body. It was his office to examine candidates for Holy Orders, and to certify their fitness to the Bishop. Our Cathedral Churches were intended to perform functions like those which were discharged of old by "the schools of the prophets,"[8] in the days of Samuel and Elijah; and we know that in ancient days the Cathedral Church of Lincoln performed that holy work. Young men came from Iceland in the twelfth century to be educated for Holy Orders here.[9] Is there not a need that this work of training for the ministry should be renewed here at the present time?[1]

The last place among the four principal dignities was held by the Treasurer, who was not a bursar or steward, but had

[8] Cp. Canon Norris in Dean Howson's volume, pp. 38—42.

[9] I have been assured of this by a learned native of Iceland, Dr. Magnusson, now resident at Cambridge. See also the evidence of it in the "Quarterly Review," vol. cxxx. No. 259, p. 232, whence it appears that two Icelandic Bishops in succession—St. Thorlak and his nephew Paul—studied theology at Lincoln. In the Episcopate of St. Hugh of Lincoln, Giraldus Cambrensis, who was his friend, "spent several years at Lincoln, for the sake of study in the then famous school of the learned Chancellor William de Monte, or Montibus," as we are reminded by our learned Prebendary. the Rev. J. F. Dimock, in the "Transactions of our Architectural Society for 1867," p. 195.

[1] This has now been done. The Lincoln Theological School numbered 35 students in training for Holy Orders in Dec., 1878.

In Canon Westcott's papers on "Cathedral Work" (in "Macmillan's Magazine," for January and February, 1870), this important principle is developed, that the Cathedrals, ought to be seminaries of theological learning and instruction, pp. 308—313.

the care of the sacred vessels and vestments of the Church.[2] This office ceased to exist about 340 years ago.[3]

In order that the functions of the two principal persons —the Dean and Precentor—might never fail to be exercised, the Statutes provided them with deputies to supply their place; namely, the Subdean and the Succentor.

Next in order followed the Archdeacons, eight in number, having stalls in the Cathedral, but going forth from it to exercise visitatorial authority in the diocese in subordination to the Bishop, and thus connecting the Cathedral Church with every parish of this vast diocese, which, when our Code of Statutes was framed, reached from the Humber to the Thames.

This connexion and ramification were further strengthened and extended by means of the canons or prebendaries, who had parochial cures and endowments in various parts of the diocese. Every prebendary was a canon of the Cathedral, and every canon of the Cathedral was a prebendary. The two names Canon and Prebendary belonged to the same person in two different respects; he was a canon in his relation to the Cathedral, and he was a prebendary of the particular place in the diocese where he had his prebend or endowment.[4] The canons and prebendaries formed, as already said, an integral part of the Chapter.

The record of this double relation survives in the form with which every prebendary is still collated to his canonry or prebend. He is instituted thereby to a particular prebend, and also to a "stall in the choir, and to a voice in the Chapter."

Every canon had a right[5] to take part in the deliberations of the Chapter on questions of general interest and importance. This right is still recognized in other Cathedrals of the old foundation, as York, Salisbury, and Lichfield. If

[2] Some idea of the wealth and magnificence of Lincoln Cathedral in this respect may be gathered from the inventories of its sacred vessels and vestments in Dugdale's "Monasticon," vol. viii. 1278—1286, ed. Lond. 1846. Cp. the "Laudum" of William Alnwick, p. 101.

[3] Le Nève, "Fasti Ecclesiæ," p. 153.

[4] A *canonry* (says Bishop Gibson, "Codex," p. 175) is the name of *office;* a *prebend* is a name of maintenance or *benefice.*

[5] The limitation of this may be seen in "Novum Registrum," p. 48.

any prebendary or canon resided in the precincts,[6] as he might do, he was entitled to an abode there, and to participate in the daily distributions, and in the divisible corporate revenues of the Cathedral.

Some of the fifty-two canons or prebendaries were continually resident at the Cathedral, and all who were not resident were required to provide representatives or vicars,[7] so that the services of the Cathedral Church might never lack the full complement of united voices singing praise to God. All the canons were supposed to come, as occasion required, from their various abodes to their sacred home, the Cathedral;—like the Levites, brought together from the Levitical cities of the tribes of Israel, to their religious home at Jerusalem.

Thus this stately Cathedral of Lincoln, planted on its "sovereign hill," and looking out far and wide upon the city beneath it, and over the vast plain around it, and being a conspicuous object at the distance of many miles, was like a Christian Parthenon on a Christian Acropolis; and by reason of the extent of its influence it had, as it were, a spiritual presence commensurate with the diocese. The spiritual life of the Diocese flowed from the Cathedral as its fountain, like the mystic river in Ezekiel's vision, which welled from beneath the altar,[8] and watered the land, and cleansed the Dead Sea. The spiritual light of the Diocese radiated from the Cathedral, the spiritual affections of the Diocese converged towards it, and the spiritual strength of the diocese was concentrated in it. It was the heart from which the life-blood flowed by arteries, and to which it was conveyed by veins. It presented to the eye of the faithful

[6] St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, A.D. 1186—1200, required them to reside ("Magna Vita," p. 132).

[7] See "Laudum," p. 103. The stalls of the *Vicars* in Lincoln Cathedral, beneath the stalls of their respective canons, whose deputies they were, remained till the seventeenth century, and may be seen represented in the view of the interior of the Cathedral in Dugdale's "Monasticon," vol. viii. p. 1267. Their name is still preserved on the entrance of the buildings at the south side of the Cathedral, and called *Vicars' Court*. The term *Minor Canon* is unknown to our *Statutes*.

[8] Ezek. xlvii. 1, 10.

an image of the Church of Christ, as described by the prophet Isaiah, as a living thing, going forth from Zion and enfolding the world. "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." [9]

But we must now turn our eyes to the other side of the picture.

The decay of our Cathedral institutions is due to the same causes as the weakness of our parochial system in former times—namely, to *non-residence and pluralities.*

To begin with the Bishop.

No rule of residence is prescribed to him in our Statutes; but it is evident from them that he was expected to be often present in the Cathedral, and to take the principal part in its sacred services; and also to bring the Chapter together for consultation from time to time. Bishop Alnwick's Tower—still standing in the old episcopal Palace at Lincoln, and shaded by its stately sycamore—and the remains of the chapel erected by him in that Palace, where he resided from 1436 to 1449, may be regarded as mementoes of his desire to comply with the rules laid down by him in the more enduring structure that he reared in the digest of Statutes which he framed, and which still remains unimpaired.

Various causes prevented the efficient discharge of the duties of episcopal residence and personal oversight. The enormous size of the diocese, containing more than 1250 parishes, occupied the time, and absorbed the care, and exhausted the strength of the Bishop. The episcopal palace at Lincoln was dismantled by the civil wars in the seventeenth century. The old episcopal residences in the neighbourhood of Lincoln, at Nettleham, at Stow, at Sleaford, at Newark, and others at Liddington, Woburn, Banbury, and Dorchester, disappeared or were in ruins. The Bishop was relegated to his manor of Buckden in the county of Huntingdon. All honour be paid to such Bishops as Robert Sanderson, who, as his diocesan Register shows, strove

[9] Isaiah ii. 2. Micah iv. 1.

nobly against those difficulties, and who, when he was more than seventy-three years of age, laboured incessantly to discharge his duties, holding no less than seventy ordinations, in different parts of the diocese, in one year, till, after a little more than two years, his strength failed, and he entered into his rest on the 29th January, 1663. All honour be also paid to such Bishops as William Wake and Edmund Gibson, who held Visitations of their Cathedral Church, and also (as their Registers prove) collected accurate and minute information concerning the spiritual condition of every parish in the diocese.

As we have seen, each of the dignitaries of the Cathedral had specific duties assigned and appropriated to him; and they were *bound to reside* habitually, in order that those duties might be effectually performed. This was the strength of our Cathedral system. As long as it recognizes that the tenure of an office involves the discharge of definite duties by him who holds it, and that, therefore, special qualifications are requisite for the office, fit persons will be appointed to fill it. But if the law of residence be relaxed, or if the holders of dignities be distracted by various other employments, and if, in our capitular body, the hand be expected to do the work of the foot, and the eye to perform the functions of the ear, then the duties of the office will fall into abeyance, and no special gifts or qualifications will be regarded as necessary for the holders of it; and in the end some men may perhaps think little of the office, and more of the benefice, and ultimately the office itself may be swallowed up by the benefice.

This has been the cause of the abuse of Cathedral patronage—an abuse which in our own days has led to the spoliation and dismemberment of our capitular bodies. It was alleged, doubtless unfairly in many cases (but it is a law of great corporations, that the good members suffer with the bad), that the holders of these benefices had no special work to do; that their offices were mere sinecures; and therefore, any one was good enough to fill them. This brought them into contempt. There was little public sympathy with them; and they fell an easy prey into

the hands of Church reformers. The revenues of Cathedrals were taken away from them, in order to be bestowed on those who bore the burden and heat of the day in the cure of souls in our populous cities. No great institution is ruined except by itself. The calamities which befell our monastic orders in the sixteenth century were due to the abuses in our monasteries; and the disasters which more recently overtook our Cathedral bodies arose in great measure from their culpable neglect of their own laws.

Let us therefore not speak harshly of the framers of the celebrated legislative statute of 1840,[1] which bore some resemblance to the Acts for the Dissolution of Monasteries three centuries before, and which introduced a new era into the history of our Cathedral institutions.

The framers of that measure lived in a time of great religious and political excitement. There was a loud cry for the improvement of the spiritual condition of our populous cities. That improvement could not be effected without additional endowments for the maintenance of the ministry there. Men saw that the wealth of our Cathedrals was in the hands of many who did little service to the Church, and reflected little credit upon it. The Cathedrals were objects of attack, and were exposed to a pitiless storm, because of their wealth and inefficiency. They were a cause of weakness to the Church. She was like the tempest-tossed ship, in which St. Paul sailed from Myra to Malta, of which we read that in the hour of peril, "the sailors lightened the ship, and *cast out the wheat into the sea.*"[2] Happily the wheat of our Cathedrals was not cast into the sea, but was used in providing food for hungry souls. Our legislators determined to apply a very large portion ef the revenues of Cathedrals to the relief of the spiritual destitution of our large towns, and to the sustentation of the parochial clergy ministering in them. They were assured by the leading statesmen of the day—the Duke of Welling-

[1] 3 & 4 Vict. cap. 113, passed 11th August, 1840. The other recent statutes which concern Cathedrals are 4 & 5 Vict. cap. 39; 5 & 6 Vict. cap. 26, cap. 108; 6 & 7 Vict. cap. 77.

[2] Acts xxvii. 38.

ton and Sir Robert Peel—that, if the Church made this surrender of a portion of her property for this purpose, the Legislature would co-operate with her by grants from other sources. This has not been done.

It is to be deplored, that the Ecclesiastical legislators of that day did not make themselves acquainted,[3] as they might have done, and as was done fourteen years afterwards by the Cathedral Commissioners,[4] with the constitution of Cathedrals, and with the distinctive character and condition and requirements of each Cathedral Church, considered specially and severally by itself, and that they did not deal with each Cathedral accordingly. But they passed one general sweeping Act, in which all Cathedral bodies were stretched upon one Procrustean bed, and were reduced to a rigid uniformity.

The confusion that has been thus introduced into the history of English Cathedrals is a great evil. For example, it is well known, that in Lincoln and all the Cathedrals of the old foundation, the precentor is the principal canon; and that in those old Cathedrals there were priest vicars, but not minor canons. But the Legislature has borrowed the words "Minor Canon" from the Cathedrals of the *new* foundation, where the precentor is not a canon but a minor canon, and has imported those words into Lincoln Cathedral and other Cathedrals of the *old* foundation, where the precentor is the first among the canons. In this, as in various other respects, it has showed little knowledge of our Cathedrals, and less sympathy with them.

In that Act of 1840, the Legislature assigned to every

[3] As a specimen (I regret to say it) of this deficiency in the "Church Commission," which framed the Reports on which the Act of 1840 was founded, the following extract from their Second Report (p. 9) may be quoted:—"The principal distinctions between the two foundations (of Cathedrals) which bear upon the subjects of the present report are these. The old comprise not only the Dean and canons-residentiary, who *compose the Chapters* of each, but various other prebendaries." The Report does not acknowledge the prebendaries as canons, or as having any place or voice in the Chapter. Compare above, p. 307.

[4] In 1852—1855. As one of the members of the "Cathedral Commission," I feel bound to say that a principal part of the work was done by the late Canon Selwyn of Ely.

Dean of a Cathedral a term of eight months' residence, but it did not assign to him any specific duties to be done while he was resident. On the other hand, it allowed him to be despoiled of those honourable and useful functions which formerly belonged to him, and imparted dignity and efficiency to his office. In many Cathedrals the Dean possessed archidiaconal jurisdiction over the city, and in the numerous parishes connected with the Cathedral in all parts of the diocese. At Lincoln he had the cure of souls in the precincts, and of all that large body of persons who were engaged in the services of the Cathedral Church. But by the diminution of their number, and by the sequestration of the prebendal endowments, he found himself without a parish, as well as without an archdeaconry; and the exercise of his authority is confined within a narrow sphere, very different from that assigned to him in former times.[5]

Again, by reducing the number of the canons-residentiary to four,[6] in most Cathedrals, and by specifying *three months* as their term of residence, the Legislature seems to many persons to authorize, if not to prescribe, *nine months' non-residence* for the so-called *residentiaries*. The requirement of *one quarter* of a year's *presence* is interpreted by some to legalize *three-quarters* of a year's *absence*.[7] This is exactly the reverse of the definition of the *residence* of a *parish priest*, who cannot be absent from his benefice for more than

[5] Our late revered and beloved Chancellor (Chancellor Massingberd) in his Essay in Dean Howson's volume, pp. 175, 176, says that "the Dean who had archidiaconal jurisdiction is now left without the slightest power beyond the walls of the Cathedral."

[6] One canon-residentiary was added at Lincoln; but, as Bishop Kaye well observed in his "Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury," p. 31, note, this was only a step towards restoration:—"We learn from Browne Willis that, before the Reformation, there were never fewer than six residentiaries at Lincoln."

[7] It ought, however, in justice to the Legislature, to be stated that the requirement is "three months *at least*" (3 & 4 Vict. cap. 113, sec. 3), which is quite compatible with the requirement of some local statutes that the term of residence should be *eight months*. In their Second Report (p. 11) the *Church* Commissioners, proposed that alterations should be made in the local statutes to reduce the term of residence to this uniform standard of *three months*. Happily this has not been done. The "Cathedral Commissioners" recommended *nine* months' residence.

three months in a year. The term "*canon in residence*" seems also to many persons to suggest that the other three canons-residentiary are not in residence, nor expected to be so; and the one canon in residence (pardon me for speaking plainly), who in some Cathedrals is non-resident for nine months in the year, is supposed to represent the whole body of a Chapter, consisting, it may be, as ours does, of more than fifty persons; and the whole Chapter of the Cathedral is supposed to be concentrated in him.

Besides, by limiting the name *canon* and *canonry* to the *four residentiaries*, each of whom, some think, may be non-resident for nine months, they have practically deprived the other canons—more than fifty in number in this Cathedral—of a title, that of canon, which had belonged to them for more than seven hundred years; and by alienating their property they have made them virtually to cease to be *prebendaries* also, as well as canons, and have left them with what is called an "unendowed prebend," which seems to be a contradiction in terms.[8]

Brethren, I have felt it a duty to speak freely on these things, because there can be no hope of a remedy for an evil unless we look the evil fairly and fully in the face. If we resolve to do nothing, let us be sure that other persons will not be equally content to sit still. Let us be thankful that much has been already done in recent times for the improvement of the noble fabrics and sacred services of some of our Cathedral Churches, especially our own. But much remains to be done for the quickening of their spiritual life; and if we do not do what we can to correct abuses and to strengthen the things that remain, and encourage others to do so, there is too much reason to fear that the legislative experiment of 1840 may be repeated, with still more disastrous results, at no distant time.

What, then, is the course to be pursued?

In order that a reply may be given to this question, you, have been gathered together to-day.

Happily for us, our Cathedral system is not one of in-

[8] A *canonry* is an *office*; a *prebend* is a *benefice*. See note, p. 310.

flexible stiffness and rigid constraint, but of pliant elasticity and expansiveness. We possess ample independent powers in our Statutes for improving our own system by spontaneous action and internal reforms, guided and regulated by those principles which are enunciated in our laws, and embodied in our constitution.

Let it be remembered that the Bishop of the diocese, acting in concert with the Dean and Chapter (in which I include all the canons or prebendaries of the Cathedral), can modify our laws and usages without any extrinsic aid, in any way not contrariant to the law of the land.[9] And we have a right to claim of the Legislature that we may have free scope for the exercise of these inherent powers, before any application is made of coercion upon us from without.

Let me therefore now offer a few suggestions.

First, it appears to me that the Bishop of the diocese is bound to promote the restoration of the ancient constitution set forth in our Statutes.

The Bishop of a diocese is called a Father in God, and the Cathedral Church is called the Mother Church of the diocese. It is the parish church of all in the diocese.[1] Its influence ought to be felt in every part of the diocese. It is the Bishop's duty to endeavour that these names may not be mere idle words, but that, by God's help, the Bishop, when occupying his appointed place in his Cathedral, may be a personal centre of unity, and that the Cathedral may be a local centre of unity, to the diocese. It is his duty, and ought to be his happiness, to do all that in him lies, that the capitular and parochial elements of the diocese may not be antagonistic to one another, but may work harmoniously and lovingly together for the same blessed ends—the glory of God and the good of His Church. He will therefore rejoice in every occasion which brings the parochial clergy, and especially the canons or prebendaries of the

[9] In 3 & 4 Vict. cap. 113, sec. 47, there is a recognition of this power for particular purposes, and with some additional conditions.

[1] Bishop Gibson, "Codex," tit. viii. cap. i. p. 171.

diocese, into union with the Cathedral, and with himself and every other member of the Cathedral, for united worship and counsel.

In some Cathedrals, difficulties have arisen from a want of a clear definition of the relations of the Bishop and Dean in the Cathedral Church. Nothing is more injurious than vagueness and uncertainty in such matters as these. It will be my duty and happiness to communicate with my very reverend brother, the Dean (in whom I rejoice to recognize a college associate of forty years ago), with entire frankness on this and every other subject which may concern our position and functions in this House of God, in which I trust we may walk together as friends;[2] and let me not disguise from him and from you my opinion that the Bishop is as much the Ordinary of his Cathedral as he is in any church of the diocese. This question has recently been investigated by eminent canonists (Sir Robert Phillimore and Dr. Tristram),[3] and has been determined in that sense.[4] I think that even a cursory view of our own Statutes would lead to the same conclusion.[5]

Next, as has been already said, the Dean formerly discharged important pastoral functions in the city, and exercised a wide archidiaconal jurisdiction in the diocese. He was seen from time to time in all parts of the diocese.

[2] Ps. lv. 15.

[3] Whose opinion, dated Doctors' Commons, December 9th, 1864, has been printed.

[4] By canon law and statute law in all cases, whether in Cathedrals or parish churches, if any difference or dispute arises as to the mode of conducting the Divine Service, the appeal is to "the *Bishop of the diocese*," who is to *take order* for appeasing and quieting the same. See the prefatory rubric in our Book of Common Prayer, "Concerning the Service of the Church." The Dean and Chapter (says Bishop Gibson, "Codex," tit. viii. cap. ii. p, 174) may not alter the ancient and approved usages of the Church without the consent of the Bishop. I need not refer to sect. 17 of "the Public Worship Regulation Act," 37 & 38 Vict. 1874.

[5] See, for instance, "Novum Registrum," pp. 4, 10, and 20—22: the Dean takes an oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop; and see the "Laudum," p. 96, line 9, where the Bishop is called "Ordinarius;" and compare the observations in the "Quarterly Review," vol. cxxx. No. 259, pp. 239, 240, and the late Chancellor Massingberd's Essay, p. 180.

May it not be suggested, that unity and efficiency would be imparted to the parochial system of our city, if the clergy of the several parishes were brought together under the presidency of the Dean, and might enjoy the benefit of his counsel and encouragement in all matters of parochial and public interest—moral, social, and religious? One weakness, especially in our great cities, proceeds in a great measure from the isolation of the clergy, and from lack of clerical and lay conference and co-operation. It can hardly be expected that the parochial clergy of a city will act together so harmoniously under the headship of one of their own body, as under the guidance of one raised above them in rank and dignity. It is, I think, to be desired that the Dean of every Cathedral Church should be also the Dean of the city; and that the clergy of the churches of the city should look to the Cathedral Church with filial reverence and affection as the parish church of the diocese, and especially of the city in which it is.

Next, in the words of our late beloved Chancellor Massingberd, "*a specific office ought to be assigned to each canonry*, and the fulfilment of its duties to be strictly enforced."[6] This can be done by us without further legislation. Indeed, such an assignment of specific duties to Canons, and such a performance of them, are clearly prescribed by our Statutes.

The same learned writer says,[7] "the prebendaries are all canons, and in the greater Chapter they have equal votes; but it very early became the practice for some of them to undertake a definite term of residence, and to be entitled to a share in the capitular revenues."

These words suggest a double action on our part.

First, let all the prebendaries or canons of the Cathedral be frankly and unreservedly recognized as brethren by the residentiaries. Let the words of the ancient form by which the prebendaries are collated to their canonries,—"We

[6] Chancellor Massingberd, in Dean Howson's volume on "Cathedrals," pp. 177, 178.

[7] Ibid. p. 177.

assign to thee a voice in the Chapter, and a stall in the choir,"—be made a reality. Let the prebendaries be gathered together from time to time into this stately and beautiful Chapter-house,—restored to its ancient beauty,—for united consultation and action on matters concerning the welfare of the Cathedral and the diocese.

This can be done without any fresh legislation. In fact, it is expressly prescribed by our Statutes.

Who can tell, my brethren, whether if these deliberative functions had been exercised, and this joint action had been resorted to, when Wesleyanism first arose in this county, and was spreading itself over the diocese, the good elements in that great religious movement might not have been cherished and fostered by the Church, and the errors and extravagances of it have been corrected and controlled? And who can say whether the opportunity has irrevocably passed away for such conciliatory action as this with regard to the great body of Methodism, or at least with respect to some leading members of it?

Next, let some of the prebendaries be enabled to come into residence. Formerly, during many centuries, they were entitled to dwellings, if they signified a desire to reside; and in that case they shared in the daily distribution and in the divisible revenues of the Chapter. But a change has taken place. The prebendaries of our Church pay fees (about eight pounds) on their admission to their canonry or "unendowed prebend," and those among them who have preaching turns are obliged to defray the expenses of their journey to and from the Cathedral.

It is much to be wished that in the negotiations of capitular bodies with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the transfer of capitular estates to them, some provision were made for the prebendaries. Every prebendal stall ought to have some endowment attached to it; and the Legislature has happily provided[8] that under certain conditions our prebends or canonries—which, let us remember, are not suppressed, but suspended—may be re-endowed

[8] 3 & 4 Vict. cap. 113, sec. 20, and 36 & 37 Vict. cap. 39.

and revived. Thus additional vigour might be infused into the body of residentiaries, and additional work might be done by it. Without going outside of our Cathedral doors, let me specify the restoration of the early daily Matins,[9] with a short exposition of Scripture, and another Service on Sundays of a congregational character, with a Sermon. The Church accommodation in the City of Lincoln falls lamentably short of the spiritual wants of its increasing population. Not one-sixth of that population is found in our churches on the Lord's Day. We need more churches, and we need more frequent Services in our existing churches. Let our Cathedral set an example in this respect.[1]

The Cathedral Church ought to be an object of interest to every parish in the diocese, and to exercise its influence there. Annual gatherings here of parish choirs and of our Church teachers and Church workers would do much to diffuse that influence, and to spread that interest, and bring great blessings.

To take a wider range, the performance of missionary work in our great towns, and the encouragement of religious education in our schools, would afford ample scope for a band of zealous men going forth from our Cathedral as from a centre of spiritual life.

My reverend brethren,—Let me commend these matters to you; and, in doing so, let me ask your attention to the Table of Preaching Turns settled by a decree of Bishop Sanderson[2] in 1662. It may be submitted for consideration whether some clauses of that decree, which have fallen into disuse, might not be revived and put in force; and whether also some modifications of that table, which seem to be required by change of circumstances, might not be adopted.[3]

[9] This has now been done.

[1] This has now been done.

[2] Nov. 1662. See Bishop Kennett's "Register," p. 825. "Statutum et Decretum Roberti Lincolniensis Episcopi de annuis Præbendariorum concionibus in Ecclesiâ Cathedrali solemniter habendis; dat. apud manerium nostrum de Buckden, 7 Nov. 1662." Cf. "Canons of 1603," can. 43.

[3] This has now been done.

I will now proceed to put into your hands copies of such "Articles of Inquiry" as I have directed to be prepared, and to be exhibited to you; and I request you to have the goodness to supply me with answers to those Articles on the day which will be named in the schedule of prorogation of our present proceedings.

And may God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, Three Persons and One God, bless you and keep you, guide and prosper you in all your endeavours to promote His Glory and the good of His Church, and the increase of unity and brotherly love among ourselves, now and for evermore. AMEN.

ARTICLES OF INQUIRY

EXHIBITED to the Dean, Canons Residentiary, Canons non-Residentiary or Prebendaries, Priests Vicars or Minor Canons, Vicars Choral, and other Ministers and Members of the Cathedral Church of S. Mary, Lincoln, at the Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God, CHRISTOPHER, by Divine permission Bishop of Lincoln, in the fifth year of his Consecration, and in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and seventy-three.

1. Do the members of the Capitular foundation correspond at the present time to those appointed in the Statutes; and if not, what alterations have been made in this respect, and for what purpose?
2. (*a*) Are the Services of the Church duly performed in the Cathedral as prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer?

   (*b*) How often is the Holy Communion administered?

   Are the Holy Days of the Church observed? and is notice given of them according to the Rubric?

   (*c*) How is the Offertory applied? Is any account published of its disposal?

   (*d*) Is the "Table of Preaching Turns" observed as settled by Bishop Sanderson in 1662?

   Are the Prebendaries permitted to exchange their turns as allowed in that order?

   Are the fines, if incurred for non-preaching, applied in the manner there prescribed?

   (*e*) Is suitable accommodation afforded to the congregations in the Cathedral?

   How many will the Choir contain, as now arranged?

   Is due provision made for their kneeling in Public Prayer?

   (*f*) Is the Cathedral, or any part of it available for *Private* Prayer?

(*g*) Does it ever happen that Divine Service in the Cathedral is left without the attendance of any Canon in the Choir? (Statutes, p. 41.)

(*h*) Is there any Service of "Early Matins" in the Cathedral? If not, how long has it been discontinued?

(*k*) Do the Dignitaries of the Cathedral preach in those places whence the revenues of the Church are derived? (Canon 43.)

(*l*) Could the Nave of the Cathedral be made more available for special Services?

(*m*) Is there any Voluntary Choir connected with the Cathedral?

3. Do the "*principales personæ*," specified in the Statutes, discharge the proper duties respectively assigned to them therein, as far as the circumstances of the case allow?

4. What is the statutable residence required of the "*principales personæ*," and is it duly kept?

5. (*a*) Is the "Canon in Residence" authorized to supersede a "*principalis persona*"—also in residence—in the discharge of those special duties which are assigned to such "*principalis persona*" by the Statutes?

(*b*) What is the statutable definition of the word *Chapter?* (Statutes, p. 28.)

(*c*) How far has it been modified in consequence of recent legislation?

(*d*) Are the non-residentiary Canons summoned to Capitular Meetings? (P. 39.)

(*e*) What is the meaning of the words, "We assign thee a place and voice in the Chapter," which are used at their Collation and Installation?

(*f*) Have you any suggestions to offer as to the benefits derivable from Capitular Meetings for deliberation on matters affecting the welfare of the Church and the Diocese, and for affording advice and help to the Bishop?

6. When Canons non-residentiary are present in their stalls in the Choir, are they invited to take a part in the Divine Service of the Church?

7. Who has the custody of the common seal of the Chapter? Is the Statute respecting it complied with? (P. 21, p. 50, p. 106.)

8. Has any attempt been made to apply the powers for the removal of suspension of Canonries under the provisions of 3 & 4 Vict. cap. 113, sec. 20?

9. Have the requirements of that Act (sec. 44) with regard to the disposal of patronage been complied with?

Have the provisions of that Act (sec. 47) been resorted to for the alteration of the Statutes as to the disposal of patronage or other purposes specified in the Act?

10. What are the stipends of the Priest Vicars?

Are they provided with residences?

Are they responsible for repairs of them and for dilapidations?

11. Are the Cathedral Church and the Buildings belonging to the Dean and Chapter insured against fire?

12. What are the emoluments of the Vicars Choral?

What are the regulations for their due attendance in the Choir at Divine Service?

Are they habitual Communicants in the Cathedral?

Is any provision made for their retirement, when incapacitated by old age or other infirmity?

13. What are the emoluments of the Choristers?

Are the statutable requirements for their moral and religious education, and for their board and lodging in the precincts, and for their superintendence duly complied with? (Statutes, p. 70.)

Is any provision made for them on their leaving the Choir?

14. What are the stipends of the Masters of the Free Grammar School?

Is the scale of fees for instruction in it so regulated as to make it accessible generally to the children of the middle classes of the City?

Have any exhibitions been founded on it for the maintenance of scholars at the school, or at the Universities?

15. Are the records and archives of the Chapter kept in safety and in good order, and duly arranged and indexed?

16. Is the Library accessible to the Clergy of the City and Diocese, and to the public?

Are the Books lent, and on what security?

Has the Library any fund for its support and improvement?

17. Has the liability to repair the Chancels of the Churches belonging to the Dean and Chapter been transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or does it still remain with the Capitular body?

18. Has any endeavour been made to establish a Seminary for the training of Candidates for Holy Orders in connexion with the Cathedral, and, if so, with what success?

Have Theological Lectures been given in the Cathedral, as prescribed by the Statutes?

19. In the answers of the Dean and Chapter to the Cathedral Commissioners in 1853 (p. 258), the following are specified as statutable officers of the Cathedral: — "The Chapter Clerk; the Receiver-General; the Clerk of the Fabric; the Sacrist; the Succentor; the Organist; the Master of the Choristers; the Vice-Chancellor; the Lay Sacrist; the Senior Verger; the Junior Verger; two Porters; two Stall-Keepers; the Surveyor of the Chapter Estates; the Surveyor of the Fabric."

Have you any remarks to offer on the stipends or duties of these Officers?

20. Have you any suggestions to offer to the Bishop with a view of increasing the efficiency, and of strengthening the connexion of the Cathedral Church and the Capitular body with the City and the Diocese?

STUDIES OF THE CLERGY.

THE following words, on this same subject, were addressed to the Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln in 1873.

The Diocese of Lincoln contains rather more than 800 parishes. Of these some, especially in Nottinghamshire, have large populations: others, particularly in Lincolnshire, though extensive, are thinly inhabited. In both these classes of parishes the clergy are liable to be drawn away from the studies of their sacred profession.

In the more populous parishes their time is so much taken up, and their minds distracted, by the details, often secular, of their daily work, that it is difficult for them to obey the Apostle's[4] precept: "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine; meditate on these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all." Consequently, in such cases, the teaching from the pulpit is apt to become meagre and jejune, or to spend itself in passionate appeals, which excite the emotions of the hearers, but do little to convince their reason, or to refute popular errors, or to confirm them in the faith, and to build them up on the solid foundation of Christian doctrine and practice.

It is greatly to be wished that in an age like the present —of eager inquiry, restless speculation, philosophical scepticism, bold unbelief, and consequent licentiousness in religion, morals, and politics—the Clergy of our great towns were in a condition to exercise that salutary influence on the minds of the people which is so much needed by society, and which they ought to possess, as the national teachers of Christianity, and as the appointed champions of the Faith.

May it not be hoped that the laity in populous places may be induced to relieve the clergy from the care of "serving tables,"[5] and that the clergy may be enabled to devote themselves earnestly to the study of Theology, the noblest of all sciences? Let me be allowed to invite attention

[4] 1 Tim. iv. 13, 15.

[5] Acts vi. 2.

to the Visitation Sermon of Bishop Bull on this subject,[6] as expressing fully and clearly what I would wish to say upon it.

The moral, intellectual, and spiritual trials and dangers of the clergy in our country parishes are not less than those of their brethren in our large towns. They are tempted to suppose that because their congregations are small, and consist mainly of poor, they need not take much pains with their sermons, or improve themselves in the knowledge of Holy Scripture, and of the constitution, principles, and history of the Church.

The result too often is, that, while this temptation is yielded to, the preaching becomes dry and dreary, and is not instinct with that quickening spirit which goes to the heart of the hearer, and animates him with the love of God and man, and while it confirms his faith, excites him to do his duty. It seems to be forgotten by some that the catechizing of children is one of the most difficult, useful, and honourable works in which the Christian priest and pastor can be employed; and that the preaching of the Gospel to the poor was the special work of Christ; and that the souls of children, the poor, the sick, and the aged, are very precious in His sight. Where these truths are neglected, the parish church is ill-attended, the services are cold and lifeless, Communions are infrequent, the Holy-Days of the Church are ill observed, the people are put off with two services on a Sunday, perhaps even with only one, and the House of God remains shut and empty during the rest of the week. Is it to be wondered that in such places Dissent should be rife, and children be taken away from the Church to the meeting-house, and the people be a prey to the fanaticism of ranters; that Nonconformity should assume a political character and inveigh against the National Church, and desire to subvert it, and be ready to ally itself with Secularism and Romanism for its overthrow; and that England should be in danger of seeing again the miseries and confusions of the seventeenth century?

[6] Bishop Bull's Works, i. 137. Sermon VI., "The Priest's Office Difficult and Dangerous."

To this it may be added, that, in consequence of the rapid diffusion of cheap Literature, good or bad, by means of the public press, the scepticism of our great towns is now filtering itself into our country villages, and it is very desirable that the clergy should be well prepared to supply antidotes to it.

The clergy in our country parishes have usually much time at their disposal. Some of them are heard to complain that it hangs heavy on their hands, and that they are shut out from the enjoyments of refined society; and some are known to ask for leave of non-residence on this account. But let me earnestly and affectionately exhort such persons to consider the duty of the clergy to devote themselves to professional studies, for the sake of themselves, their families, their congregations, and of their neighbours. When this is the case, no society is more agreeable or instructive than that of a country parsonage. What a delightful companion was George Herbert! The inmates of the parsonage of Little Gidding,[7] in an unpicturesque country, never found it dull. Think of the delightful intercourse of Hooker and Saravia, of Sanderson and Hammond;

> "O, could we copy their mild virtues! then
> What joy to live, what blessedness to die!"

Was not such society even more pleasant than that of Ennius and Scipio the Elder, and of Terence and Scipio the Younger and Lælius, and of Cicero and his friends at his Tusculan villa? The words of that great orator and philosopher,[8] concerning the delights and uses of literary pursuits, may be applied in a higher sense to the professional studies of the English clergy. "Hæc studia adolescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium et solatium præbent; delectant domi, non impediunt foris, pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, *rusticantur*."

The present is an age when nothing is allowed to pass unchallenged. We need a learned Ministry; especially we require a Priesthood mighty in the Scriptures.

[7] See the "Life of Nicholas Farrar," by Dr. Peckard. Cambr. 1790.
[8] Cicero pro Archia Poeta, c. vii.

May I desire you, my reverend brethren, never to let a day pass without careful study of the Bible. Let me ask you to read critically the four Lessons appointed in the daily Calendar; and in the Daily Service *never to omit either of the two Lessons* appointed in the Calendar; and to read the Lessons at home, before you read them in Church. Intelligent *reading* of Scripture is the best *preaching*. It may seem a slight thing to notice, but *false quantities* in proper names (such as "*Timōthēus*," "*Urbānē*" and others sometimes heard in the public reading of Scripture, e. g. Rom. xvi.) are justly supposed to imply more than meets the ear.

You will endeavour, my dear friends, to be acquainted with the best literature of the day. But do not take your theology from articles in magazines and newspapers. Read the ancient Fathers of the Church, especially those of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age, and the Ecclesiastical Historians, especially Eusebius; and such authors as Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and St. Chrysostom.

Study diligently the best writers of the Church of England, especially those of the era of the Reformation, such especially as Bishop Ridley (his life by Dr. Gloucester Ridley is very valuable), and Bishop Jewel; and those of the next age, such as Hooker, Andrewes, Laud, Bramhall, Sanderson, Pearson, Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Bull, Wilson, Waterland, and Bishop Butler.

At the present time the careful and discriminating study of two periods of our Church history is very necessary, namely, that of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and that of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Troubles in the seventeenth century.

As to the former, beware, I entreat you, of the dangerous fallacy which is propagated by Romanists, and accepted by some Protestants, that our Reformers *set up a new Church* in England. Their work was not innovating but restorative. They did not make what was new, but preserved, purified, and confirmed the old.

That good and great man, the late Dean of Chichester,

Dr. Hook, who has lately entered into his rest, was providentially preserved to continue his work, the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, to the death of Archbishop Laud, in whose biography you may see a narrative of the events of that troubled time, which, in some respects, resembles our own age. Professor Mozley's Essay on Laud's Life and Times (like his other Essays) is invaluable.

Let me also mention the Lectures of Bishop Sanderson *on Conscience*,[9] and *on Oaths;* and the Prefaces to his *Sermons*, which offer valuable helps for the solution of many problems, ecclesiastical and civil, at the present time.

The question of the necessity of *an outward call, and lawful commission*, for the valid exercise of the *Christian Ministry*, is one which now occupies, and will continue to occupy, the attention of thoughtful persons in this country; and it is one on which you ought to be able to speak with clearness and power. On this subject nothing in the English language surpasses, in logical acumen, and vigour of style, the *Letters of William Law to Bishop Hoadly*. They may be placed side by side with the *Provincial Letters* of Blaise Pascal; in both cases it might be wished that sarcasm had been spared; and that "suaviter in modo" had been joined with "fortiter in re." [1]

Wherever these and other studies (such as poetry, natural philosophy, and history, showing God's power, wisdom, and love) are cultivated by the clergy in country parishes, their lives are not lonely and dismal, and their families are not discontented and unhappy; they are not tempted to resort to frivolous amusements, or to indulging in low animal pleasures. The vices of the monastic life may reproduce themselves in our country parishes. In some respects solitude is more dangerous than society. But how beautiful is the

[9] The Latin Editions, London, 1655 and 1660, and in the fourth volume in Bishop Jacobson's Edition of Sanderson's Works, Oxford, 1854; an English translation, London, 1722; also in part by Dr. Whewell, in 1851. A cheap reprint of these Lectures (in English), has been lately published, see above, p. 121.

[1] W. Law's Letters to Hoadly, London, 1753, 1762, republished in the Scholar Armed, i. 279, and two of them by Mr. Joshua Watson in 1835.

pastor's life formed on the model drawn by George Herbert in his "Country Parson," [2] and as described [3] by one of the

[2] "The Priest to the Temple; or, the Country Parson: his Character and Rule of Holy Life." By George Herbert. 1632.

[3] Keble's "Christian Year," for First Sunday after Easter.

"I thought it scorn with Thee to dwell,
A Hermit in a silent cell,
While, gaily sweeping by,
Wild Fancy blew his bugle strain,
And marshall'd all his gallant train
In the World's wondering eye.

"I would have join'd him, but as oft
Thy whisper'd warnings, kind and soft,
My better soul confess'd—
'My servant, let the world alone,
Safe on the steps of Jesus' throne
Be tranquil and be blest.

"'Seems it to thee a niggard hand,
That nearest Heaven has made thee stand,
The Ark to touch and bear,
With incense of pure heart's desire
To keep the censer's sacred fire,
The snow-white Ephod wear?'

"Why should we crave the worldling's wreath,
On whom the Saviour deign'd to breathe,
To whom his keys were given;
Who lead the choir where angels meet,
With angels' food our brethren greet,
And pour the drink of Heaven?

"When sorrow all our heart would ask,
We need not shun our daily task,
And hide ourselves for calm;
The herbs we seek to heal our woe,
Familiar by our pathway grow;
Our common air is balm.

"Around each pure domestic shrine,
Bright flowers of Eden bloom and twine,
Our hearts are altars all;
The prayers of hungry souls and poor
Like armèd angels at the door
Our unseen foes appal.

brightest ornaments of that holy society, who may be called the George Herbert of the nineteenth century.

Let me pass to another point. Bishop Sanderson, in his "Articles of Inquiry," issued before his Visitation of the Diocese of Lincoln in 1662, requested the clergy to furnish him with any interesting particulars which they could discover in their parish churches, such as coats of heraldry and ancient inscriptions, illustrative of the history of the county. We have no good County History of Lincolnshire. Might not the parochial clergy employ some of their spare time in collecting the historical records of their respective parishes? The parish church, the churchyard, the parish register, the manor-house, the ruined abbey or castle, and other local monuments, documents, and traditions, would supply materials for a County History, which could not be written without such a combination as this, and might easily be composed by means of such a division of labour. Some of our brethren in Lincolnshire and Nottingham have entitled themselves to our gratitude by already publishing many interesting *monographs* of this kind, and others might be mentioned as having made valuable collections in manuscript, which it is to be hoped will not be lost, but be applied to this purpose.

This suggestion is now being acted on, 1879.

Let me now say a few words on more homely topics.

Many things tend to show that the Clergy of the Church of England must be prepared for temporal hardships. Clerical Incomes for the most part remain stationary.

"Alms all around and hymns within,
What evil eye can entrance win
Where guards like these abound?
If chance some heedless heart should roam,
Sure, thought of these will lure it home
Ere lost in Folly's round.

"O joys, that sweetest in decay,
Fall not, like wither'd leaves, away,
But with the silent breath
Of violets drooping one by one,
Soon as their fragrant task is done,
Are wafted high in death!"

Prices for provisions, for household labour, for almost everything, are on the increase. The Apostolic precept, "Thou therefore, my son, endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ,"[4] has a special force for the Clergy at the present time. It was well said by a heathen poet, "I will enlarge my income by narrowing my desires,"

> "Contracto meliùs parva cupidine
> Vectigalia porrigam."[5]

My reverend brethren, let it be our rule to live within our income, whatever it may be, and to endeavour to train our families in the same way. The biographical memoir[6] of the Rev. Robert Walker, Vicar of Seathwaite, in Lancashire, on the banks of the river Duddon, for more than sixty years, in the last century—who, with a slender income, brought up well a large family, and—like Virgil's Corycian old man—

> "Regum æquabat opes animis,"[7]

and showed that—

> "Divitiæ grandes homini sunt vivere parcè
> Æquo animo,"[8]

may be commended to your attention at the present time, not indeed for exact imitation, but for the spirit of noble frugality, generous self-denial, and Christian piety and holiness, which animated and regulated his life.

The Apostle St. Paul, in his pastoral Epistles, lays great stress on the personal character, not only of the Clergy, but of their wives and children and households. "A Bishop must rule well his own house (he says), having his children in subjection with all gravity;" "he must be blameless, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly;"[9] and the same precepts are given to deacons.[1] And their wives must be grave, sober, and faithful in all things; and they must rule their children and houses well. And he

[4] 2 Tim. ii. 3.
[5] Horat. 3 Od. xvi. 37.
[6] It may be found in the Notes to W. Wordsworth's Sonnets on the River Duddon, vol. iv. p. 320, ed. London, 1849.
[7] Virg. Georg. iv. 132.
[8] Lucret. v. iii. 7.
[9] 1 Tim. iii. 4. Tit. i. 6.
[1] 1 Tim. iii. 8.

says to us all, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another."[2]

Bear with me, for calling your attention to these things. The family of the Pastor of a Parish is public property. The holy influences diffused from the Parsonage may preach to his people with the silent eloquence of a continual sermon. Who can say how much the character of the Apostle St. Peter was strengthened by the courage of his wife who accompanied him on his missionary journeys,[3] and went before him to martyrdom?[4] How much Gregory Nazianzen's father, who was Bishop of Nazianzus, owed to his wife, Nonna, and how much Gregory, afterwards Patriarch of Constantinople, owed to her also, we learn from Gregory himself.[5] The spiritual blessings of the conjugal union of Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, and his wife, Therasia, are well known from the letters of St. Augustine.[6] One of the holiest of our English Pastors and Poets,[7] George Herbert, in that golden manual of the Parish Priest, the *Country Parson*, says that "the Parson is very exact in the governing of his house, making it a copy and model for

[2] Rom. xiii. 8.

[3] 1 Cor. ix. 5.

[4] Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 30.

[5] See his Orations, Orat. vii. p. 199; and Orat. xviii. pp. 335, 343, 361, ed. Bened. Paris, 1778; and his Poems, vol. ii. pp. 1131—1149.

[6] Augustine's Epistles, vol. ii. Ep. 27, Ep. 31, and Ep. 32, and passim.

[7] George Herbert, Country Parson, chap. x.; St. Jerome's Epist. xxxiv. ad Nepotianum, on Clerical Life (tom. iv. p. 256, ed. Bened. 1706), has many wholesome precepts expressed with great vigour, e. g. "Ignominia sacerdotum est, propriis studere divitiis. Divinas Scripturas sæpius lege, imò nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur; disce quod doceas; non confundant opera tua sermonem tuum, ne quis tibi respondeat, Cur quæ dicis ipse non facis? Lacrymæ auditorum laudes tuæ sint. Nolo te declamatorem esse, sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum Dei tui eruditissimum. Verba volvere et celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere, indoctorum hominum est. Nec rusticus et simplex frater ideo se sanctum putet, si nihil noverit; nec peritus et eloquens linguâ æstimet sanctitatem. Cogitemus crucem Christi, et divitias lutum esse putabimus. Cave ne linguam aut aures habeas prurientes; ne ipse aliis detrahas, aut alios audias detrahentes. Nemo invito auditori libenter refert. Sagitta in lapidem non figitur. Discat detractor non detrahere, dum te videt non libenter audire detrahentem." Excellent advice for these times.

his Parish;" "he requires three qualities from his wife, to train up his children and maids in the fear of God, with prayers and catechizing and all religious duties; secondly, a curing of wounds with her own hands; thirdly, a providing for her family in such sort that neither they want a competent sustentation nor *be brought in debt.*" This caution, not to be *brought in debt,* is one of great importance to the moral and religious influence of a Clergyman, and the success of his ministry. But do not try to improve your income by *speculating.* The love of money, gambling, and usury (often condemned in Scripture) bring their retribution even in this life, if not by temporal loss, yet by what is worse, a lowering of the moral and spiritual tone—a thing fatal to the Christian Ministry.

Suffer me, to commend to those of my younger brethren in the ministry who are unmarried the advice of George Herbert, in that book,[8] "Do not marry hastily;" and do not marry without competent means of decent maintenance for a wife and family. But if you resolve on marriage (after fervent prayer to God for His guidance) take care to act on the advice you give to others when in reading the Marriage Service you say that "Marriage is not to be enterprised nor taken in hand lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." Your own professional usefulness and the temporal and spiritual happiness of many others, beside your own, depend on your choice of a wife. "A prudent wife is from the Lord,"[9] "a gracious woman retaineth honour,"[1] "a virtuous woman is a crown to her husband;" "her price is far above rubies; his heart doth safely trust in her."[2]

I cannot close this paper without referring with thankfulness to the success which has attended the operation of a Society instituted in 1870, for augmenting the incomes of Poor Benefices in Lincolnshire. By its instrumentality more than 53,000*l.* has been applied to that purpose (1879). The

[8] Chap. ix.
[1] Prov. xi. 16.
[9] Prov. xix. 14.
[2] Prov. xii. 4; xxxi. 10, 11.

machinery is very simple. Let 100*l.* be raised by subscription for any benefice under 200*l.* a year; let this 100*l.* thus raised be brought to the Association; it will add another 100*l.* to it; and then carry the 200*l.* thus raised, to Queen Anne's Bounty, which will probably meet it by another 200*l.*, and thus the living will be augmented by 14*l.* a year for ever, and this process may be repeated. It has now been applied to many poor livings in this Diocese.

THE MISSION AT LINCOLN.

The following Addresses were delivered before and during a Mission, which proceeded from the Cathedral Church at Lincoln, and was held in the Parishes of that City, with the hearty co-operation of the Parochial Clergy in February, 1876; and which, by the Divine Blessing upon it, has produced abundant and abiding fruit.

THE COMING MISSION.

TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN.

Dearly beloved in the Lord,

It is proposed to hold a Mission at Lincoln in about two months' time, namely, in February next (February 19—27); and, in conjunction with my brethren the Clergy I earnestly invite your help in endeavouring to make it effectual.

The word *Mission*, used in this sense, seems to require explanation. A *Missionary* means one who is *sent*. Every clergyman is a missionary; he is sent by Christ to every soul committed to his care.

Again, in popular language, a *Mission* is usually applied to the preaching of the Gospel to the *heathen*. But Lincoln has enjoyed the blessings of Christianity for many centuries; it has many ministers of the Gospel, many places of religious worship, many Christian schools, and almost every one there either has, or may have, a Bible. A Mission at Lincoln is not like the mission of the prophet Jonah to Nineveh, but rather like the preaching of Jeremiah, or of Ezekiel,—or even of Christ Himself and His Apostles,—to Jerusalem.

The first thought, therefore, suggested by a mission to Lincoln is one of solemn responsibility. Suffer me, then, to

ask of you—What fruit are you bringing forth of the spiritual benefits which have been vouchsafed to you for many generations? What is your present state as to Christian faith and Christian practice? What your religious condition generally, as to temperance, sobriety, purity, chastity, and "holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord"? (Heb. xii. 14.) What as to honesty, probity, and integrity? What as to charity and brotherly love, which are indispensable requisites for acceptance with God? (1 Cor. xiii.) We know from our future Judge, that it will "be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon," and even for "Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of Judgment," than for those who have heard the Gospel, and who live godless lives (Matt. x. 15; xi. 21. Luke x. 13). Unless we believe and obey the Gospel, we may read in the miserable fate of Jerusalem, a prophecy of our own destiny for Eternity.

Ought not, therefore, the time of a Mission to be a season to us all of self-humiliation, of penitential shame and sorrow for the past, and of godly resolutions for the future? Ought it not to be a season of prayer for pardon, and for grace?

Let us thank God for these Missions. But believe me the principal part of a Mission is not the Missioner: nor is the Mission-week the main thing in the work of a Mission. No: the labour of the Mission-week will be fruitless, unless you are willing to do your part. I speak both to clergy and laity. The Mission-week is the seed-time; but there must be much careful *previous preparation* of the ground *before* it, and much *watchfulness after it*. Unless this is the case, the Missioner may produce a little temporary religious excitement, but that excitement will soon pass away, and will be succeeded by apathy and indifference. It will be only like a fever followed by an ague.

What then is to be done?

First, let each of us be a missioner to himself; have an "inquiry room" in your own heart; set up a confessional there; test your own faith and practice by the only unerring standard, that of God's Holy Word. Do you believe in the never-ending Life to come? Are you acting in that belief?

Do you realize God's Omnipresence and Omniscience? In your daily business—in the street, the shop, and the mart—in the social meeting and domestic circle, as well as in your secret chamber, are you conscious of His all-seeing Eye, and do you think often of Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell, and Eternity? Do you pray to God daily? Do you read His Word daily? If not, begin now; and not only this, be a missioner to your household, to your children, to your servants. Have you family prayer? If not, begin now. Are you an employer of labour? Be a missioner to those who are helping you to be rich in this world; care for their souls; enable and encourage them to come to the Mission; thus they will assist you to be rich for Eternity.

This Mission is for us all. Every one may profit by it. There is no one who ought to stand still; our life is a battle, a race. Even with the holiest among us, acts of faith and love may be made more frequent and fervent. We are all "members one of another" (Ephes. iv. 25). "None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself" (Rom. xiv. 7). It was the first murderer, Cain, who said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" (Gen. iv. 9). *You are* your brother's keeper. No one can hope to be saved who cares little if his neighbour is lost. The best way to save ourselves is to try and save others. What was the use of the angel coming down to stir the waters of Bethesda, unless there were friends of the sick to put them into the pool? (John v. 4—7). The paralytic in the Gospel would not have been cured, unless there had been loving hands to carry him up to the house-top, and to let him down in the presence of Christ (Mark ii. 4. Luke v. 18). What will be the use of the Missioner, unless you help the Mission? The worldly-minded, the profligate and the libertine, the sceptic and unbeliever, will not come of their own accord to Church and to the Mission. Be you a missioner to them—"Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in" (Luke xiv. 23). Tell them that "the wages of sin is Death" (Rom. vi. 23), that the hour is coming when all that are in the graves will hear the voice of the Son of God, and will come forth, to be judged according to their works (John v.

28); and that He will be revealed in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel; and that they will be punished with everlasting destruction (2 Thess. i. 7). But tell them also that there is rest for the weary and heavy-laden in Christ (Matt. xi. 28); tell them that there is "a fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness" there (Zech. xiii. 1); tell them that "if we walk in the light as He is in the light, ... the blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7); tell them that there is perfect pardon and peace —infinite and eternal—in Him, and in Him alone, to all who truly turn to Him with faith and repentance, and sincere purpose of amendment of life. Tell them that He tasted death for every man (Heb. ii. 9); that whosoever cometh to Him He will in no wise cast out (John vi. 37); and that there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth (Luke xv. 7). Thus the fallen may be raised, the doubting may be settled in the faith, the erring may be reclaimed, the sinner may be saved, by your means; and at the great Day you will have the inexpressible joy of seeing in their everlasting bliss the fruit of your own work in the Mission.

Remember also that the love of the good Samaritan was shown, not only by going to the wounded traveller lying in the road, and by pouring in oil and wine, but by setting him on his own beast, and bringing him to the inn, and taking care of him and providing for him afterwards (Luke x. 33—35)—"Go and do thou likewise." I speak both to clergy and laity. Not only pour in the wine and oil of Christ's blood and of spiritual grace, in the sinner's wounds, but bring *him to the inn*, to the inn of Christ's Church; take care of him there; provide, according to your means, for his spiritual maintenance there, by liberal alms-giving to works of piety and charity, in the building and endowing of churches, and in all that is requisite for the care of sick souls, not only after the Mission is over, but after your own departure from this world to a better.

But, further, the Missioner may preach, and you may work, but all will be profitless except the Holy Spirit guides and helps both him and you. Paul may plant, Apollos may

water, but it is God Who gives the increase (1 Cor. iii. 6). The seed is sown, but it cannot take root, and grow, and bear fruit, without the sunshine, dew, and rain of the Holy Spirit from above. The Holy Ghost is given in answer to earnest prayer (Luke xi. 31). Pray, therefore, for the gift of the Holy Ghost; pray for it in the name of Christ; pray for it now; pray for it during the Mission; pray for it after the Mission. You will find, at the end of this paper, some prayers for the Mission, which may be added to your private and family devotions.

Brethren beloved in the Lord, the first Mission of which we read in the Christian Scriptures, after the Ascension of Christ and the coming of the Holy Ghost, is contained in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Let me invite your careful attention to it. It is like a picture, drawn by a divine hand, of what a Mission ought to be. There we see a fearless and fervent missioner, St. Peter, standing up boldly and preaching Christ to those who had lately crucified Him. Many were converted by his preaching, and they who were converted were baptized (Acts ii. 41). Observe what follows: "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Believe me, that the real fruit of a Mission is not in sudden emotions, and violent ejaculations, and vehement professions, and passionate ecstasies and raptures; it is not in fanatical rhapsodies, nor even in a few fitful acts of piety or charity (which may be like the sudden growth of Jonah's gourd, or of the seed which fell on the rock and sprang up hastily, and was soon scorched and withered by the sun); but it is to be seen in "patient continuance in well-doing" (Rom. ii. 7) in the midst of trial and difficulty. He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved (Matt. xxiv. 13). It is to be seen in soundness and steadfastness of faith; it is to be seen in the "work of faith and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father" (1 Thess. i. 3); it is to be seen in unity and fellowship in Apostolic doctrine and discipline, in prayer and praise, and in the habitual devout reception of the Holy Communion.

Remember the concluding words of that Scriptural record of the first Mission: "The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 47). The fruit of that Apostolic Mission was seen long after St. Peter's voice had ceased to be heard; it was seen in distant lands, and in succeeding ages; it increased far and wide, and it abides even to this day; it was seen in bringing men nearer to one another and to God in the Church of Christ; and thus it prepared them and qualified them by His grace ministered to faithful and loving hearts in the holy offices of the Church on earth, to dwell together for ever in the Church glorified in heaven.

The results of a successful Mission will be visible long after the Mission is over. They will appear in fuller Churches, and more frequent Baptisms, more reverent Confirmations, and more devout Communions; they will be seen among all classes of society, in larger abundance of the fruits of the Spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22).

That such fruits as those may be seen at the great Day of Harvest to have been produced largely by the Mission in this place, is the earnest prayer of your faithful brother and servant in the Lord,

C. LINCOLN.

Riseholme, Lincoln,
Tuesday before Advent, 1875.

PRAYERS FOR A MISSION.

Most merciful Father, we beseech Thee to send upon Thy Ministers Thy heavenly blessing, especially on the Missioners of this place; that they may be clothed with righteousness, and that Thy Word spoken by their mouth may have such success that it may never be spoken in vain; and grant that in all our words and deeds we may seek Thy glory, and the increase of Thy kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

O Lord Jesu Christ, the Great Shepherd of the Sheep; look with pity on the populous places of this land, especially on this city; Bring into the way of truth all that err and are deceived; Awaken those who are in sin; Arouse the careless; Humble the proud and unmerciful; Comfort the fearful and sorrowful; Raise up them that fall; Heal the broken-hearted; Give them true repentance, faith, fear, and love, and so sanctify them with Thy grace that they may bring forth the fruits of the Spirit in godliness, righteousness, and holiness, and may come to Thy heavenly glory, through Thy merits and mediation, Who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost One God blessed for ever. *Amen.*

Also Prayer for Missions above, Vol. ii. p. 224.

O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed by Thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil; For Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, For ever and ever. *Amen.*

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. *Amen.*

THE MISSION COME.

Words spoken by the Bishop in the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, at the Holy Communion, to Missioners and Church workers, on the first day of the Mission.

Brethren and Sisters in Christ,—Let us thank God that He enables us to begin our Mission in this holy place—in this Cathedral Church—and with this act of holy Communion. Even the best among you must feel his spirit sink within him when he thinks of the greatness of the work and of his own littleness. Where, then, is our help? It is here. It is in God, and in communion with Him. The prophet Isaiah, at the beginning of his mission, was in the temple, and saw the Lord of Hosts, as he describes in the 6th chapter; and he then exclaimed, "Woe is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips; and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips." And how was he comforted? A seraph took a living coal from the altar and laid it on the prophet's mouth, and said, "Lo, this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged." And then the voice of the Lord was heard, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me." Thus Isaiah became a Missioner to Israel; and so you to-day, in this church, at this Holy Communion, will have as it were a living coal, taken from God's altar, laid upon your lips to cleanse them and warm your hearts with the holy fire of zeal and love. "Of ourselves we can do nothing. All our sufficiency is of God; we can do all things through Christ, Who strengtheneth us." Even the most zealous and courageous of missioners, Elijah, after his triumph at Carmel, fainted, and prayed God to take him to Himself. He sat down, weary and sorrowful, beneath the dark shade of the juniper-tree in the wilderness; but then he was strengthened,—and how? By the angel calling him and saying, "Arise and eat, for the journey is too great for thee; and he arose and ate, and he went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights to Horeb, the mount of God." Doubtless you, too, are often

tempted to sit down faint and weary of your work beneath the dark juniper-trees of gloomy thoughts in the wilderness of despondency; but there is an angel at hand for you, especially in this Holy Sacrament, to strengthen you with food, and to enable you to arise and travel through this earthly wilderness to the Heavenly Horeb.

In the magnificent visions of the 45th Psalm, and in the 9th chapter of the prophet Zechariah, and in the 6th chapter of the Book of Revelation, Christ is revealed as a mighty Conqueror and King. He rides on a white horse, the horse of light. He has a bow in His hand, and a quiver on His shoulder. You are arrows in that quiver. He it is that takes you forth out of that quiver, as arrows feathered with plumage from the wings of the Divine Dove, and places you with His own hand on the string of His Divine bow, and discharges you at the "heart of the King's enemies" (Ps. xlv. 5), not for death, but for eternal life. "As My Father sent Me," He says to all Apostolic Missioners, "so send I you," and "lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Therefore forget yourselves, think only of Him; pray earnestly with your hearts, even when preaching with your lips.

This, which is specially applicable to you, is also true of all who work with you; and what I now say to you, I say to all. Let us all go forth in His name, from His house, in faith and love, with earnest prayer for His help, to promote His glory, and do His work in the saving of souls.

But, beloved, your mission not only needs divine strength for yourselves, but it is to be a blessing to others. Well, therefore, may it begin in this holy place, with this holy act. This Holy Table, at which "we show the Lord's death until He come," is like the altar in that glorious vision of Ezekiel, the 47th chapter, which is a representation of the Christian Church. What do we see there? Beneath the altar—the type of the Cross of Christ—there was a fountain and well-spring, from which flowed living waters, deepening and widening in their course through the wilderness, and flowing at length into the Dead Sea, which they made to teem with life. There is an emblem of your own work.

Going forth from the sanctuary of this church, where you feed upon Christ, you will make a stream to flow of living waters from the "fountain opened" in His bleeding side "for sin and uncleanness," to irrigate and fertilize the dry deserts of society, and to purify and animate the stagnant pool and Dead Sea of sin, with living waters. This is your Mission, and during the whole of your work your eye will be upon Him. "All my fresh springs are in Thee."

And, brethren beloved in Christ, in what way,—by what order, method, and plan,—is this work to be done? This is a hard question. There is, I am sure, a holy art, a sacred science, in Missions. It not only requires heroic courage and angelic enthusiasm; it needs heavenly wisdom. Who is sufficient for these things?

Let me offer one suggestion here.

Consider, how the great Apostolic Missioner, St. Paul, would act if he had come among your number to this place this week. The answer to this question is found in the Acts of the Apostles, and in his Epistles. In the Acts of the Apostles we have two missionary sermons of St. Paul, one in the 13th chapter, in the Synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, to Jews, who had the Scriptures of the Old Testament; the other to Gentiles, at Athens, in the 17th chapter. In them he lays the foundation, in an endeavour to produce in his hearers a sense of personal responsibility, on the ground that their bodies will be raised from the grave by Christ, Who raised Himself from the dead; and that they will be called to a strict account of their words and works at the Day of Judgment, and will receive their final doom accordingly for everlasting bliss or woe, from Him Whom God hath appointed to be the Judge of Quick and Dead. He thence declares the guilt and misery of Sin, and enforces the necessity of true Repentance, and of Faith in Christ, as the only means of justification and reconciliation with God, and of eternal Life. He states "the first principles" of missionary work in the 6th chapter to the Hebrews, and declares them to be "the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God; and the doctrine of baptisms and of laying on of hands" (or Con-

firmation), "and of resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgment."

Yet further, if we examine St. Paul's Epistles *in the order in which they were written*, we observe the same method. The earliest of his Epistles, those to the Thessalonians, deal with little else than the doctrines of Resurrection, of Judgment, and Eternity. This is to be our mode of proceeding. We must *begin* with producing godly fear, holy alarm; and so lead up to faith and love, to love of God, our reconciled Father in Christ, and to love of man in Christ and for Christ. After the preaching of the four last things (Death, Resurrection, Judgment, and Eternity) in his Epistles to the Thessalonians, St. Paul comforts the believer with the hope of Justification by faith in Christ, in his Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, and declares the Universality of the Redemption provided by God in Christ for all who believe and obey Him. He delivers a solemn warning against schism, and inculcates the duty of charity, without which nothing profits, and of Church Unity, in his Epistles to the Corinthians; and the duty of purity, holiness, and virtue, as a corollary from the doctrine of the Resurrection, in the 15th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. He then proceeds to higher and more transcendental mysteries, especially the mystery of the Incarnation, and of the union of Christ and His Church—the union begun in Holy Baptism—in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and shows how these doctrines are to be applied to the enforcement of the daily practical household duties of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants. He sums up all in his Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus, with a clear representation of the organization of the Church, and of the duties of the Christian Ministry.

This is but a faint sketch of St. Paul's method of missionary work: let me request you to complete it.

And here let me offer a few words of caution. As the first work of the Mission is to produce a sense of personal accountability, and to deepen the consciousness of Sin, and to humble the sinner before God, and to bring him, humbled

and penitent, to Christ; and to exhort him to lay hold, with faith and love, of the hope of pardon, reconciliation, and eternal life, which are offered to the believer in Him; and to use the gifts of the Holy Spirit vouchsafed through communion with Him by the means of grace in His Church; therefore let us carefully beware of frustrating this work by putting into the mouths of our hearers enthusiastic and ecstatic hymns, which, instead of teaching them, with St. Paul, that they must work out their salvation with fear and trembling, and must seek for glory, honour, and immortality, by patient continuance in well-doing, would lead them rather to imagine that they can snatch salvation at once by a spasmodic seizure of self-assurance—a most dangerous delusion.

And suffer me also, brethren, to offer a warning, as to what are called "*after-meetings.*" The Athenian sophists of old exposed themselves to just censure by professing to be able to answer any questions offhand that might be put to them. And the difference between a wise physician and a shallow empiric is, that the former proceeds carefully, slowly, and tentatively, the other is ready to undertake any case at once, and professes to have a ready panacea for every disease. Let us not be spiritual sophists and empirics. Let us not pretend to be able to answer at once every doubt of the sceptic, or to heal all the diseases of the troubled in mind, who may come to us, in the hour or couple of hours after our preaching in the church. We shall bring ourselves and our work into discredit, and hurt more souls than we help, if we venture to do so. Let us not repel any, let us welcome all; but let us tell them plainly that we need much time, and inquiry, and thought, and study, and prayer, to do the work well. Let us do nothing, let us say nothing, in a hurry; let us exhort them to come to us privately, or to some wise, learned, and holy minister of God's word, that they may receive comfort and counsel from him; above all, let us exhort them to more careful daily examination of their own souls before God, and to study the Holy Scriptures, which will be a "lantern unto their feet, and a light unto their paths," and to more earnest and frequent prayer to

God, that He will make His way plain before their face. If they set their will to "do His will, they will know of the doctrine" (John vii. 17). Where the heart is clean, the mind will be clear.

And now to you, our dear sisters in Christ, fellow-workers in this Mission, let me say, in the words of the Apostle, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female; we are all one in Christ Jesus." He was cheered in his missionary work by the loving help of Christian women. His greatest Epistle, the Epistle to the Romans, was carried, as is commonly supposed, by a woman's hand to the capital of the world, and in it he says to the Romans, "I commend unto you Phœbe, our sister, a servant of the Church at Cenchreæ;" and in it he salutes many of his sisters in Christ. "Greet Priscilla, and Aquila (her husband), my helpers in Christ Jesus, who have for my life laid down their own necks; unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. . . . . Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us. . . . . Salute Julia, and the sister of Nereus, and the mother of Rufus, and mine. Salute Tryphæna and Tryphosa," names speaking of former worldly voluptuousness, exchanged for "labour in the Lord." We entreat you, dearly beloved, to help us in bringing women, especially young women, to the Mission, and in training those who need your care for Confirmation and Holy Communion. And now, as I began with referring to the call of one Hebrew prophet, Isaiah, so let me now conclude with the promise given to another—the Prophet Daniel, the man greatly beloved—which I pray God may be fulfilled in all our brethren and sisters here present,—"They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." "Go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (Dan. xii. 3, 13).

THE MISSION COME.

A few words spoken in the Cathedral Church, by the Bishop of Lincoln, to the people on the first day of the Mission.

Brethren, this is the first day of our Mission. A Mission is a solemn appeal, it is a searching trial to us all. Some words have been spoken already to the Missioners and Church-Workers in this place.[1] But, believe me, the fruit of the Mission depends as much upon you as upon them.

In proof of this, consider the two greatest Missions held by the two greatest Missioners (with reverence be it said) who ever appeared in this world.

Who, brethren, were they? No other than the Second and Third Persons of the Ever-Blessed Trinity. A *missioner* means one who is *sent*. Those Two Persons of the Blessed Trinity were sent from Heaven on a great Mission to the world. Hear the words of our adorable Redeemer, the Mighty God and Saviour, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity: "My meat is to do the will of Him that *sent* Me, and to finish His work" (John iv. 34; v. 23, 24, 30; vi. 38, 39, &c.). And "As My Father hath *sent* Me, so send I you" (John xx. 21). And of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity He says, "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will *send* in My Name, He shall teach you all things" (John xiv. 26). "When the Comforter is come, Whom I will *send* unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me" (John xv. 26). These, then, are the two great Missioners; and no human missioner can think, say, or do anything that is good, except he be sent and empowered by them both.

And what, brethren, was the greatest Mission? What the most solemn Mission-week which the world ever saw? Surely it was the week of our Lord's Passion. Our Blessed Lord had passed the Saturday night at Bethany, and the next day everything looked bright. It was Palm Sunday, as it has since been called, and He rode to Jerusalem. He had wrought a great miracle in Bethany, by raising Lazarus

[1] See above, p. 344.

from the dead, and the people knew it, and met Him, and received Him with acclamations of enthusiasm. They took branches of palm, emblems of victory, symbols of triumph, and strewed them in the way before Him, as a mighty Conqueror. They spread their garments in His path, as if they were ready to divest themselves of all their earthly glory, and to lay it at the feet of Christ.

But there was One there—He who was the object of all this jubilant enthusiasm—He to whom they cried "Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord!"—Who knew that there was a cloud in the horizon, that the sunshine would soon fade away, and that the heavens would be covered over with gloom. He saw beyond that ephemeral triumph; and when He came near the city He wept over it: and why? because it knew not "the day of its visitation." "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." Though everything looked so brilliant, though the Temple (recently restored by Herod the Great) shone with marble and with gold, and though some of His disciples, dazzled by the splendid spectacle, said to Him, "See what manner of stones and what buildings are here," He knew that not one stone would soon be left standing upon another.

Brethren, there was scarcely ever a time when there was more of what the world would call religious demonstration than during that Mission-week. There were two millions of people in the city, there were crowds of worshippers in the synagogues and in the Temple, and they joined in rapturous Hosannas to Christ. How fair everything looked, how promising everything appeared! But, remember, that on the Monday morning of the Mission-week, our Lord in returning to Jerusalem saw a fig-tree on the way. It had a luxuriant exuberance of leaves, but Christ was not hungry

for leaves, but for fruit. "Herein," He said, "is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit" (John xv. 8). *That* was what He craved; and because He found leaves only and not fruit, what did He say? "Let no man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever" (Mark xi. 14). He blighted the leafy, unfruitful fig-tree, and doomed it to perpetual barrenness. Here was a figure of Jerusalem itself; He went from the fig-tree to the Temple, then thronged with worshippers (and typified by the barren, leafy fig-tree), and said, "My house is the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves." And what next? Recollect that the same people who had gone to meet Him, coming from Bethany on the Sunday, and who seemed zealous for the glory of the Lord at the Passover at Jerusalem, and shouted with acclamations and plaudits of enthusiasm in His honour, that very same people on the Friday joined no less vociferously in the cry, "Crucify Him, Crucify Him!" What a terrible contrast! "Hosanna to the Son of David!" and, "Crucify Him!" almost in the same breath. That Mission was not successful, as far as the people were concerned, although it was the greatest Mission held by the greatest Missioner who ever preached to the world. Rather that Mission was the very thing which caused their guilt to overflow. But it was a great success in the death of Him who came as the Missioner. There was a rich harvest, not by life, but by death. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die" (said Christ of Himself) "it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (John xii. 24). Christ's Death and Resurrection were the first-fruits of a harvest of souls.

Brethren, what thence may we learn? There may be great religious excitement in a Mission; there may be large congregations flocking to the churches to hear the Preacher; they may talk much of his sermons and admire his eloquence: the nave and aisles of the churches may ring with the sound of jubilant hymns, and with the chorus of hosannas and hallelujahs. There may be fervent demonstrations of spiritual excitement in "after-meetings." But all this may be only like the foliage of the fig-tree on the wayside, rustling in the vernal breeze, and shining brightly in the

sun,—but to be withered by the breath of Christ. It may be like the popular enthusiasm of the crowds of Jerusalem on the Sunday of the Mission-week of the Passion, to be followed by "crucify Him" on the Friday.

Here, brethren, is our warning. What was the reason of the terrible catastrophe of that awful week? It was because the people were self-satisfied; it was because they had no sense of their own sinfulness, and because they imagined that, while they were in the grasp of the Tempter, they were specially favoured of God. They drew nigh unto Him with their lips, but their heart was far from Him (Matt. xv. 8). Therefore "in vain do they worship Me." Spiritual pride and self-assurance; a hollow form of godliness, without the power; a hypocritical semblance of piety, varnishing over the inner corruption of selfishness, covetousness, hard-heartedness, and sensuality, which lurked beneath that specious surface, and showed itself at last in the hatred and rejection of Him Who is the Truth, and Whose Divine Eye pierced beneath that surface, and Whose Divine Voice denounced eight woes against that hypocritical nation (Matt. xxiii. 13—29), and Who at last sent the armies of Rome to execute vengeance upon them.

Here is our warning, and a terrible one it is.

But, thanks be to God, we have our encouragement also.

Consider the next great Mission to the world, and the second Divine Missioner. Who was He? It was He whom Christ sent after His Ascension, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter. Jesus Christ had triumphed over death and the grave. He had said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." He ascended nearly at the place where He had wept over Jerusalem—the Mount of Olives. And He ascended in triumph. And then He sent another Missioner from the right hand of the Father. Contemplate the blessed results of that Mission. The first great Mission had seemingly failed, because it came to a self-complacent and hypocritical nation—a nation which trusted in outward forms and ceremonies, and in superficial semblances of piety without vital religion.

What, then, was the reason that this other Mission was

so successful? It was not only because St. Peter who preached to the people, did not trust in himself, but in Christ, and was animated by the Holy Ghost, Whom Christ had sent; and stood forward bravely, so that he who had been a coward at Passover was a hero at Pentecost. True it is, that all missioners must have the gift of God's grace if they would assert unpopular truths against popular errors; with that gift, he who had thrice denied his Master, afterwards stood forward and confessed Him in the presence of those who crucified Him. Not only this: St. Peter preached to the people the Resurrection of our Lord, and His Ascension. He told them, as the Psalmist had said, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thy foes Thy footstool." And he added, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, Whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

But, observe, the People now did their part. What a change had been wrought in them between Passover and Pentecost! There was a vast multitude, but it was no longer a multitude like that of the Passion-week; it differed from it in this—the multitude in the Passion-week were self-satisfied; at Pentecost they were dissatisfied with themselves. Their consciences were stricken by a sense of sin, and, "*being pricked in their heart,* they said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, *what shall we do?*" (Acts ii. 37).

Brethren, let us also be pricked in our own hearts with a sense of sin, and then there will be good hope of the success of our Mission. We must examine ourselves, and repent. St. Peter's answer to the people was, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." This was the result of the second Mission. The difference, you see, was not in the Missioner, but in the People. Even if we could have Christ coming into the world again, even if we had the Holy Ghost

coming down upon us from heaven, yet, if the seed of the Word falls on the wayside, or upon stony places, or among thorns, it will be unfruitful. But let us hope better things in this Mission. Many will be pricked in their heart, and many will ask, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" and the answer is, "Repent, and ye shall receive remission of sins." "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool" (Isaiah i. 18). The word and the promise are to all: "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (Eph. v. 14). "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. vi. 23). The hour is coming, when all that are in the graves will hear the voice of the Son of God, and will come forth, to be judged according to their works, either to everlasting bliss, or eternal woe (John v. 28); He will be revealed "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction" (2 Thess. i. 7—9). But there is rest in Christ for the weary and heavy-laden (Matt. xi. 28); in Him there is "a fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness" (Zech. xiii. 1); "if we walk in the light as He is in the light, ... the blood of Jesus Christ" the Son of God "cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John i. 7): there is perfect pardon and peace—infinite and eternal—in Him, and in Him alone, to all who truly turn to Him with faith and repentance, and sincere purpose of amendment of life. He tasted death for every man (Heb. ii. 9). He gave Himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii. 6); and whosoever cometh to Him He will in no wise cast out (John vi. 37); He will give them the Holy Ghost if they pray earnestly for Him, to enable them to do His will, and to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22); and finally He will give a crown of life immortal to all who believe, love, and obey Him.

Observe, brethren, that the result of the Mission at Pentecost was not transitory and evanescent; we are expressly told that "they who received the Word *continued*

steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts ii. 42).

Note, I entreat you, the force of each of these words: "*They continued steadfastly;*" they were not like the seed of which our Lord speaks, which fell on stony ground, where it had no root, and when the sun was up was scorched and withered away (Matt. xiii. 6. Mark iv. 6). They were not offended when persecution arose because of the Word. No, they continued steadfastly, rooted, established, and settled in the faith. They were not like Orpah, of whom it is said that when the time of trial came, she kissed her mother-in-law Naomi, and bade her farewell, and returned to the land of Moab and of Chemosh; but they were like Ruth, who clave to her, and went with her to Bethlehem, and became an ancestress of Christ (Ruth i. 14). They were not like Demas, who for a time was a fellow-labourer with St. Paul (Col. iv. 14), but in the hour of danger, when he was most needed, slunk away in fear, and who "loved this present world" more than Christ and His Gospel; and forsook Paul, the Lord's prisoner at Rome, on the eve of his martyrdom, and departed unto Thessalonica (2 Tim. iv. 10). But they were like "Luke, the beloved physician," "whose praise is in the Gospel" (2 Cor. viii. 18), who remained, though alone, with the Apostle (2 Tim. iv. 11), and, like him, they endured unto the end, and were saved (Matt. xxiv. 13). "By patient continuance in well-doing" they sought "for glory, and honour, and immortality" (Rom. ii. 7). They were faithful unto death, and therefore they will receive a crown of life (Rev. ii. 10) from Him Who "is the Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25).

And, brethren, in what did they continue steadfastly? "In *the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship.*" The Apostles' doctrine—or teaching. What was that? Not merely articles of faith, but also acts of duty. They did indeed continue in the *faith,* for "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6). And "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not" (says Christ) "shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16). And His

Apostles declare that there is but "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 5), and they charge us to fight the good fight of faith (1 Tim. vi. 12), and to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints" (Jude 3).

But, brethren, the word *doctrine*, or *teaching*, means much more than this; it means that *living faith which worketh by love* (Gal. v. 6). The great Apostolic preacher of the Pentecostal Mission, St. Peter, says, "Giving all diligence, *add to your faith virtue;* and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. i. 5—8). And look at the second chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to Titus, and see how he applies the word *doctrine*, which occurs there three times, to the daily duties of life: the duties of old men and young men, of old women and young women, of husbands and wives, of masters and servants; who are exhorted "to adorn the *doctrine* of God our Saviour in all things" (Titus ii. 10).

And what more? After this great Mission of the Holy Ghost the believers continued steadfastly not only in the Apostles' doctrine, but in the Apostles' *fellowship*. They were not split up into sects and parties, as so many are nowadays. No, there were no divisions among them: "all that believed were together;" united, by visible acts of communion, in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, in the Church of God.

And how did they *show* their *fellowship* with the Apostles? By joining together with them in the *breaking of bread*, that is, in the reception of the Holy Communion, and "in *the prayers*" of the Church. Thus they dwelt together as members of the mystical Body of Christ; and by being united as fellow-members in Him, they received grace; they were branches of the true Vine, and by abiding in Him, they were enabled to bring forth much fruit. They drank in the spiritual sap of the Vine, and thus were enabled to put forth, as it were, not only beautiful green leaves, but

also to bear rich fruit of purple and golden clusters of good works in their daily lives (John xv. 1—17).

Mark, as a consequence of this union with one another in Christ, they that believed "*had all things common;* and sold their possessions and goods, and *parted them to all men, as every man had need*" (Acts ii. 44, 45).

In our own days we hear much of "communism and socialism." There is, brethren, a genuine communism and true socialism—that of Christianity. There we have the substance; the world offers only the shadow. In the Church of God, after that great Mission-week of Pentecost, "the multitude of them that believed," we read, "were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them, that ought of the things which he possessed *was his own;* but they had *all things common.* . . . Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of *lands or houses* sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need" (Acts iv. 32, 34, 35). Nor did they regret those generous acts of self-sacrifice. No, they rejoiced in them. "They, continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house" (or rather, *at home* in their own Christian assembly, or church), "did eat their meat *with gladness* and singleness of heart; praising God, and having favour with all the people; and the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 46, 47), or, rather, such as were accepting the gracious offers of salvation.

Brethren, here is our pattern and encouragement. Let us endeavour to reproduce that grace and glory of primitive faith, piety, and love, which shone so brightly when the field of the Church was spangled with the fresh morning dews of the Holy Spirit from heaven.

We are too well satisfied with ourselves; we ought to examine ourselves and compare our own practice with that standard of duty. A new Domesday Book of England and Wales has just been published in two large quarto volumes, and has been presented by Her Most Gracious Majesty to

both Houses of Parliament. There we see a long catalogue of wide demesnes, a rich rent-roll of princely revenues. It would be a national shame to imagine that, in this nineteenth century, when Bibles are so plentiful, and there is such a loud profession of religious zeal, and so much talk about charity and philanthropy at public meetings, there are not many persons in that long list of many hundred pages who would not willingly imitate the spirit which animated the Church of the Apostles. "There is no man" (says Christ) "that hath *left house or lands* for My sake and the gospel's, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time" (in the consciousness of God's favour), "and in the world to come life everlasting" (Mark x. 29. Luke xviii. 29).

Brethren, let us do what we can. Let us take heed to ourselves. A Mission is a perilous thing. It may be a great blessing; but it may be a great bane. It will be to us as we use it. There is no greater danger in our spiritual life than in having our feelings excited without practical results. Religious emotions without religious actions, and religious habits, are specious delusions and subtle impostures, by which our ghostly Enemy would beguile us (as he beguiled the Jews), into assuring ourselves that we are God's favourites, while we are victims of the Tempter. Let us beware of this dangerous self-deception. Let us not imagine that we can snatch salvation by some spasmodic act of personal self-assurance. Feelings are not Faith. The tree is known by its fruit. Let us not be leafy, barren fig-trees. Let the fruit of the Mission be seen in our lives. Let it be seen in ourselves, in our households, in our parishes. Let it be seen in more of prayer private and public, and in daily study of the Bible. Let us examine ourselves. Is there any among us who is conscious of being guilty of some great sin against God's holy law? "Then, thou art the man." The Mission is for thee. Is there any addicted to intemperance? "Thou art the man." The Mission is for thee. Is there any guilty of sins of uncleanness, fornication, adultery, lasciviousness? "Thou art the man." The Mission is for thee. Remember the words of God in His Holy Book, "They that do such things, shall

not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. vi. 9. Gal. v. 21). "Because of these things, the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience" (Eph. v. 6. Col. iii. 6). Thy body is a "Temple of the Holy Ghost," and "if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy" (1 Cor. iii. 17). "Thy body is a member of Christ" (1 Cor. vi. 15). Wilt thou desecrate what belongs to the Holy One? God forbid. "They that sow to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption;"—the everlasting corruption of the "worm that dieth not," and the anguish of "the fire that is not quenched" (Mark ix. 44, 46, 48). But they that sow to the "Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting" (Gal. vi. 7, 8). "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. v. 8).

Consider, beloved brethren and sisters in Christ, what joy there is among the angels of heaven when they behold one sinner turning to God by repentance. Think of the holy angels now looking down upon you, and waiting to rejoice in your salvation, and to welcome you to those unspeakable delights which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him" (1 Cor. ii. 9).

But you are members one of another; therefore apply the lesson of the Mission not only to yourselves singly, but to yourselves collectively. Fathers and Mothers of children, Masters and Mistresses of families, Employers of labour, do you realize the fact, that you are accountable to God for those "within your gates"? May the number of those among us be greatly increased, of whom God will speak as He spoke of Abraham His friend, who had 318 servants (Gen. xiv. 14), and who cared for them all (Gen. xvii. 23). "I know him, that he will command his *children and his household* after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord" (Gen. xviii. 19); and who will say with Joshua, the type of Jesus, "Choose you . . . whom ye will serve; . . . . as for me and *my house*, we will serve the Lord" (Josh. xxiv. 15). Would that all great capitalists would lay these things to heart! How blessed would they then be in this

life, and for ever! Let every household resolve to begin every day with *family prayer*.

Again, is there any one who harbours malice against another—any who says he will not forgive his neighbour such and such a wrong? If there is, such a man says that he is determined not to go to heaven, for no one who will not forgive, can enter there. The Lord, who is the judge of the quick and the dead, says, "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive you your trespasses" (Matt. vi. 14, 15). And if your trespasses are not forgiven, you will be "cast into outer darkness, where will be weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth" for ever. But "if ye forgive, ye shall be forgiven;" and "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy" (Matt. v. 7). This Mission-week, I trust, will see many reconciliations.

Again, there are the sins of fraud. By deceiving others a man destroys himself. May it not be hoped that many will resolve to make no sacrifice of truth? for by sacrificing the truth they sacrifice their own souls. May it not be hoped that any who have wronged others, may now resolve to make restitution, and so be restored to peace in their own consciences and to favour with God?

And let not only each person individually, domestically, and socially make the Mission a time for some definite work, —some vigorous struggle against evil,—some steady advance in what is good; but let each Parish engage parochially in some new enterprise of piety and virtue; some design for helping Missions at home and abroad; some work of school improvement and organization; some plan of Church building or Church restoration; some addition to the parochial endowments for the glory of God, and the spiritual and temporal benefit of the poor. Let all who are able associate themselves, under the guidance of their Pastors, as Sunday School teachers, or district visitors, and collectors of funds for Missions, and in preparing children for Baptism and Confirmation. Then, indeed, the fruit of the Mission will abound and abide.

And, lastly, let us remember that there is a Great Mission

to Come;—a Mission from heaven not only to single souls, or to single cities, or single nations, but to the whole World. A Mission to the Dead and to the Living. Christ, the Great Missioner, who came in Passion Week to Jerusalem, He Who came to preach the Gospel to the World, He Who sent forth His Apostles as His Missioners to evangelize all nations, He Who sent the Holy Ghost from heaven at Pentecost to regenerate and sanctify humanity, He Who sends all Missioners in every age, will come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and will send forth His holy Angels as Missioners to gather His elect from the four winds (Matt. xiii. 14); and to separate the evil from the good; to cast the tares into the fire, and to gather the wheat into His barn. At that great Day, dearly beloved, may it please Him to reap a rich harvest from this place. May none of you be amongst those bundles of tares that will then be cast into the fire. May there be a rich harvesting of corn from this place. On that great Mission-day may you be stored in the garner of the Lord; and may the Missioners who by God's grace have now come to labour among us, then "come again with joy, and bring their sheaves with them" (Ps. cxxvi. 7).

Prayer after the Mission.

Almighty God, Giver of all good gifts, we render unto Thee humble and hearty thanks for the blessings vouchsafed to the work of the Mission in this place. Grant that its fruit may abound and abide, to Thy honour and glory, the spreading forth of Thy Gospel, the increase of Thy Kingdom, and the salvation of immortal souls. Give grace to all Pastors of thy flock, and Preachers of Thy Word, that they may be examples of the believers in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith and purity; and on all hearers of Thy Word send, we beseech Thee, O Lord, Thy heavenly blessing, that they may be grounded, settled, and established in the faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity; and by patient continuance in well-doing may seek for glory and honour and immortality. Grant, that being alway pre-

served in the Unity of the Church, and steadfastly abiding in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers, they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things; and constantly enduring unto the end, and being faithful unto death, may receive a crown of everlasting glory from Him Who is the Resurrection and the Life; and that we together with them may rejoice for ever in Thy heavenly Kingdom, through the merits and mediation of thy dearly-beloved Son Jesus Christ, Who with Thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, One God world without end. *Amen.*

A PASTORAL LETTER FROM THE BISHOP AFTER THE MISSION.

TO THE INHABITANTS OF LINCOLN.

My dear Friends,—In the name of my brethren, the Clergy, and my own, let me invite you to join with us in thankfulness to Almighty God, the Giver of all good gifts, for the blessings vouchsafed to the work of the Mission in this City.

It has been a great joy to us, and to many among you, that the Mission, which began on the morning of Saturday week with Holy Communion in the Cathedral, the Mother Church of the City and the Diocese, has been continued with growing life and energy, day after day for nine days, by a simultaneous effort in the twelve Churches of the City; and that thus we have all been united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, for the Glory of God and the salvation of souls.

The able and zealous Ministers of the Gospel who have come to us as Missioners, do not look for their reward upon earth, or for the praise of men. But we esteem them very highly for their work's sake, and you will join with us, I am sure, in gratitude for their labour of love, and in hearty prayer that the good seed sown by them in many hearts

may be rendered to them in abundant blessings at the Great Day of Harvest.

The Lay helpers in our parishes, our beloved brethren and sisters in Christ, have effectually aided in the work; and they will allow me to request a continuance of their valuable assistance to the Clergy in bringing children to baptism, and in teaching in Schools and at Bible Classes, especially as preparatory to the Confirmations, which will be held by me at Lincoln, and by my dear Brother, the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, at a suitable interval after the Mission.

To our Nonconformist brethren, especially to Nonconformist ministers, let me be allowed to say, that it is far more gratifying to us to dwell on those great fundamental truths, in which we agree with them, than to refer to those things (of which I do not disguise the importance) in which we differ from them; but let me be allowed to assure them of our love for the words of good-will and brotherly kindness, with which they wished us God Speed in the Mission; and let me express an earnest desire and give utterance to a fervent prayer that the day may come, when they will be wholly united with us, and we with them, in the great principles of Christian doctrine and discipline, as delivered by our common Lord and Master in Holy Scripture, and as received by the Holy Apostles, and by the Apostolic Churches at the beginning. We should then have nothing to fear from the powerful assaults of our common enemies, Romanism, Secularism, and Infidelity; and we might hope to join together in a great and glorious Mission against those heinous vices and deadly Sins, Intemperance, Sensuality, Selfishness, and Covetousness, which are now threatening to destroy the peace and happiness of English homes, and to poison the life-blood of the English nation.

The great Capitalists of Lincoln have cordially welcomed the Missioners to their foundries and factories. God be praised! They will, we are sure, receive a blessing from Him, far transcending all worldly wealth, which is transitory and fickle, for all endeavours on their part to procure to those in their employ a share in those heavenly and eternal

riches, which He, Who is the Lord of all, has prepared for them that love Him, and to promote the salvation of those for whom Christ died upon the Cross.

To you, my friends and brethren, the Tradesmen of Lincoln, let me offer hearty thanks for your ready compliance with the request addressed to you by me, in the name of the Clergy and my own, that your premises might be closed at such an hour, during the days of the Mission, as would afford to those in your employ an opportunity of attending its services. May the divine blessing be with you in your families, and prosper you in all your undertakings, in return for this and all your other acts of piety and brotherly love.

Nor let it be forgotten that the public Press of Lincoln, by its organs on different sides of political opinion, has united in aiding the Mission by full reports of its work, and has thus proved an efficient instrument and powerful coadjutor in diffusing its influence and its usefulness. Thus the Mission-week has been a happy truce to the strife of political parties, and has given us a delightful foretaste of that blessed time when all controversies will cease, and there will be no watch-word but Love.

Suffer me now, my dear friends, to add a few words of exhortation. The calm and steady quietness, and the devout and vigorous earnestness, with which the work of the Mission has been conducted, are happy auguries of its success.

But bear with me for saying, that if we desire it to be owned by Almighty God at the Great Day, when every man's work will be tried by a severe and searching ordeal (1 Cor. iii. 13), we must regard the Mission as only a beginning, a "day of small things" (Zech. iv. 10).

Let us beware of sitting still, and folding our arms, and of settling on our lees (Zeph. i. 10). There is no greater danger in our spiritual life than in having our feelings excited without practical results. Religious emotions without religious actions and religious habits are specious delusions and subtle impostures, by which our ghostly Enemy would beguile us into assuring ourselves that we are God's fa-

vourites while we are victims of the Tempter. Let us beware of this dangerous self-deception. Feelings are not Faith. The tree is known by its fruit (Luke vi. 44). Let the fruit of the Mission be seen in our lives. Let it be seen in ourselves, in our households, in our parishes. Let it be seen in more of prayer, and in more careful study of God's Holy Word. Let each person among us, let each household, let each parish in Lincoln, resolve with God's help to renounce all that is evil, and to abound more and more in good works. This will be a sure evidence that our hearts have not been stirred by Him in vain during the Mission. And since all our endeavours will be fruitless, unless they are quickened, guided, strengthened, and sanctified by His Holy Spirit, let me entreat you, my dear friends and brethren, to pray to Him earnestly for yourselves and for us, and for the continuance of His blessing to the Mission; and therefore let me add to this letter a prayer that may be used at your private and household devotions. And may the Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord; and the Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be amongst you and remain with you always. Amen.

I am,

Your faithful brother and servant in the Lord,

C. Lincoln.

Riseholme, Lincoln,
Ash Wednesday, 1876.

[I venture to re-introduce here the following, from p. 362].

Thanksgiving and Prayer after the Mission.

Almighty God, Giver of all good gifts, we render unto Thee humble and hearty thanks for the blessings vouchsafed to the work of the Mission in this City. Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy Name be the praise. Grant that its fruit may abound and abide to Thy honour and glory, the spreading forth of Thy Gospel, the increase of Thy Kingdom, and the Salvation of immortal Souls. Give grace to all Pastors of Thy flock, and Preachers of Thy Word, that they

may be examples of the believers in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith and purity; and on all hearers of Thy Word send, we beseech Thee, O Lord, Thy heavenly blessing, that they may be grounded, settled, and stablished in the faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity; and by patient continuance in well-doing may seek for glory and honour and immortality. Grant, that they being always preserved in the Unity of the Church, and steadfastly abiding in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers, may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things; and constantly enduring unto the end, and being found faithful unto death, may receive the crown of immortal life from Him Who is the Resurrection and the Life, and that we together with them may rejoice for ever in Thy heavenly Kingdom, through the merits and mediation of Thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, Who with Thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, One God, world without end. *Amen.*

PASTORAL TO WESLEYAN METHODISTS.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

Let me thank the kind friends who have given a welcome to the following Pastoral. In some quarters it has met with a different reception. Let me here advert to some comments upon it.

And first,—to prevent misconception,—let me repeat—what is freely allowed in the following Pastoral—that we ourselves, the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, have been much to blame; and that the unhappy separation between us and the Wesleyans is due, in no small degree, to our want of faithfulness and zeal, and to our lack of definite teaching on the doctrines, constitution, and discipline of the Christian Church; and that therefore we ought to repent and amend our ways; and to pray earnestly, and to labour diligently, that the schism may be healed; and to invite them to help us in healing it.

I have been charged with using strong language,—for instance, in saying that there may be such a sin in the Christian Church, as the "gainsaying of Core" (Korah), as St. Jude calls it, writing to Christians (Jude 11). If my readers will have the goodness to look at the Pastoral, they will see that I was quoting John Wesley; and that they who have censured me have condemned him.

But it has been asked, Why should a Bishop write a Pastoral to Wesleyans? Why does he not let them alone? He had better mind his own business. Why does he trouble them? They are quiet and contented as they are. He is only stirring up strife, and is exposing himself to the charge of folly, pride, and presumption, by meddling with them.

My friends (let me reply to such inquiries), precisely the

same questions as these were addressed more than 1460 years ago to one of the wisest Bishops of ancient Christendom, St. Augustine, when he was endeavouring to bring back the Donatists of Africa to the communion of the Church, from which they had then separated themselves.

"Why does Augustine trouble us? Why does he not let us alone? We are quite satisfied and happy as we are. We do not belong to him. He had better look to his own Church, and leave us to take care of ours. He is acting very foolishly, and is chargeable with usurpation, and bigotry, by endeavouring to domineer over us."

But that wise, loving, learned, and holy Bishop was not moved by such language as that. He thought that the Donatists might be led to consider whether they were in a safe condition; and for their sake, and the sake of the Church, he longed to heal the separation between them and her. He laboured to restore them to her communion; and thus encountered obloquy from them, and from some lukewarm Churchmen, who thought him a rash, and fanatical zealot, a hot-headed controversialist, and an impolitic enthusiast. But he pursued the work of "*troubling*" (as it was called), because it was a work of love. He compared it to the work of a surgeon, who, while he gives pain, endeavours to restore health. "Not every one (says Augustine, Epist. 93) who spares, is a friend; nor every one who wounds, is an enemy." "Open rebuke," says the wise man, "is better than secret love; faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful" (Prov. xxvii. 5, 6). "Melius est cum severitate diligere quàm cum lenitate decipere." "He who binds a man in a frenzy, or arouses one in a lethargy, is troublesome to both, but loves both; and he would not trouble them, if he did not love them." St. Augustine,—when preaching a Sermon on that grand homily of the prophet Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxiv.) to the Shepherds of Israel, which is a Manual for all Christian Bishops and Pastors, (see St. Augustine, Sermon xlvi.), and referring to the case of the Donatists,—thus speaks: "Many sheep stray from the fold of Christ, and are impatient with those who endeavour to bring them back to it. 'What' (they

ask) do you want with us? Why do you seek us? My answer is, 'because you are going astray, and are in danger of perishing.' 'But' (they reply) I love to stray, I am content to perish,—as you call it.' 'Do you indeed desire it? How much better (I answer) do I desire that you should *not* perish, but be saved! Doubtless I am importunate; but the Apostle commands me 'to preach the word, and to be instant in season and *out of season*' (2 Tim. iv. 2); and Almighty God condemns all careless pastors who do not seek the erring; He says, by the voice of the prophet Ezekiel, 'The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill, yea, My flock was scattered upon the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against the Shepherds, and I will require My flock at their hands' (Ezek. xxxiv. 4—10). Yet, further (says Augustine), "I have a commission from Christ, the Chief Shepherd; We must all stand before His judgment seat (2 Cor. v. 10). You cannot overturn the tribunal of Christ, and set up that of Donatus in its place. Therefore I must seek and search for Christ's sheep, when they are astray; and though in doing so I must go among thorns and briars and brambles, which tear my hands, yet I will gladly do it." And why? because he loved Christ, Who said, "Feed My sheep" (John xxi. 16, 17), and he did it for His sake, in order to bring back to His fold the sheep for which He shed His blood; and for which He prayed that they might all be One as He and the Father are One (John xvii. 21, 22); so that there might be one Fold and one Shepherd (John x. 16).

"Besides," adds St. Augustine, "if I do not endeavour to reclaim dissenters, but connive at schism, the members of the Church will imagine that Schism is a harmless thing, and that it matters little whether they belong to the Church or no. They will suppose that it is indifferent whether they resort to one place of worship or another. They will say,

that if religious divisions are sinful, and are condemned as such by Almighty God in Holy Scripture, the Bishops and Pastors of the Church would endeavour to heal them. But if the Bishops and Clergy do not endeavour to do so, the members of the Church will infer that the sin of schism is a mere idle and empty sound, and that only quarrelsome people ever talk about it; and thus the children of the Church will be lost, because Bishops and Pastors do not care whether schismatics are saved."

Again, St. Augustine thus speaks (on Psalm xxi. and in other places)—"You Donatists say to me, 'You have your sheep, and we have ours. Do not be troublesome to me and to my sheep, and I will not be troublesome to you and yours.' No, my dear friends (answers Augustine), these sheep are not yours nor mine; but they belong to CHRIST. Let His sheep follow Him. Wherever the Good Shepherd is, there let the flock be. If Christ is with you, let my sheep, as you call them, go to you. But no, you have separated yourselves from the Church; and Christ loves unity, and blames division; therefore let divisions be healed, and unity prevail. Come back to the communion of the Church from which you have strayed. Nothing, says St. Paul, profits without charity (1 Cor. xiii. 1—3), and no one can be rightly said to have charity who breaks the unity of the Church."

For saying such things as these, St. Augustine was called a very troublesome person by some in his own day, and was accused of stirring up strife, and was censured by many. But (said he), "The man who willingly detracts from my good name when I labour for Christ, unwillingly adds to my future reward from Him." He looked to posterity and to the judgment-seat of Christ. He looked to the commission he had received from Christ. "Nothing," he says (Epist. xxi.), "is more easy and more popular than the office of a Bishop or a Priest, if it be discharged in a careless and adulatory manner; but nothing is more miserable, or more worthy of condemnation, in the sight of God, than such an Episcopate or Priesthood as that." He was, therefore, contented to be accounted troublesome, and to be called a man of strife, as Jeremiah was (Jerem. xv. 10). He remembered

that woe is denounced in Holy Scripture against those false teachers who said, "Peace, Peace, when there was no peace" (Jerem. vi. 14), and who "put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter, and called evil good and good evil" (Isaiah v. 20), and daubed a wall with untempered mortar (Ezek. xiii. 10), so that it looked white and fair outside, while inside it was rotten and tottering. He remembered also that it was said of the greatest of prophets, "Art thou he that *troubleth* Israel?" (1 Kings xviii. 17); and that the pool of Bethesda in the Gospel would have had no healing virtue, unless an angel had descended and *troubled* the water (John v. 4); and that it was said of St. Paul and his companions, "These men do exceedingly *trouble* our city" (Acts xvi. 20), and "they have turned the world upside down" (Acts xvii. 6), and that St. Paul was called a madman (Acts xxvi. 24; 2 Cor. v. 13). And more than this, He Who is the Lord of Apostles and Prophets, the Prince of Peace, the Incarnate Word and Wisdom of God, the Shepherd and Bishop of our Souls, had to encounter similar treatment. They said of Christ, "He stirreth up the people" (Luke xxiii. 5). "He is beside himself" (Mark iii. 21); "He is a Samaritan, and hath a devil" (John viii. 48).

St. Augustine was content to be found in such company as that; and his name is now honoured on earth, and will be blessed for ever in heaven.

Besides, in addressing a Pastoral to the Wesleyans I desired to recognize them as not unwilling to be followers of John Wesley, who (as I have shown below) solemnly charge them "never to separate from the Church." I therefore regarded them as not aliens from it, and from myself, a Pastor of the Church. Have I done them wrong in giving them credit of being ready to be loyal to their Founder, and to be true to the name they bear?

It was for such reasons as these, that I put forth the following Pastoral. I have there invited the Wesleyans to a friendly Conference; and if a Conference with them, like

the "collatio"[1] of St. Augustine with the Donatists, were conducted in a spirit of brotherly love and of prayer to God for the guidance of the Holy Spirit of Truth and Peace, we might hope that the temporary trouble would lead to permanent quietness and unity, and to our happiness in this life and a better; and to the advancement of God's glory, and the salvation of many souls.

It has been alleged that the prevalence of Wesleyanism is partly due to the carelessness, incapacity, or immorality of some Pastors of the Church. I fully believe it. But one of the blessings of the Church of England is, that true doctrine is taught, and grace is dispensed, in all her congregations, by reason of the Holy Scriptures read in her Churches, and by the use of her Liturgy, and by the administration of the Holy Sacraments, and by the love of Christ acting in and by His Word and Sacraments, and in answer to the prayers of the faithful. In the Holy Scriptures, Sacraments, Liturgy, Creeds, Catechism, and other formularies of the Church of England, every member of all her congregations possesses safeguards of orthodoxy and symbols of unity, whatever the personal defects or dissensions of her Ministers may be; and therefore the sheep may be saved everywhere, even though some of their shepherds may be lost. Evil Pastors will be punished hereafter, if not here. In the mean time, their failings and sins serve to try and exercise the faith, charity, patience, and steadfastness of the people, which will not fail of an eternal reward. It would also be a salutary thing, that unworthy Pastors should be publicly warned in a Conference that they are stumbling-blocks and offences to many, and be brought to repentance and amendment, and thus the discipline of the Church be strengthened. And, as Augustine and his brethren made overtures of union to the Donatist Bishops and Clergy, might not we, in a Conference, invite our Wesleyan brethren to help us in the work of the ministry, and thus the breach between us be healed, and our efficiency be increased in winning souls to Christ?

[1] S. Augustin. Opera, tom. ix. p. 883, 884, ed. Paris 1837.

It has also been represented by some, that the tendencies to Romanism, in doctrine, practice, and ritual, which are now visible in some of our Churches, repel our Wesleyan brethren from us, and widen the separation between us. This, also, is true. But, again, let me ask, is it not very desirable that these evil results of such tendencies should be plainly set forth and brought to light, and that Clergy who are chargeable with such delinquencies as these should be warned that they are sinning against Christ, and against souls for which He died? Is it not probable that many of them would be debarred from such uncharitable proceedings as these, by plain and affectionate words spoken in public Conference with those who are scandalized by them?

It has also been alleged by some, that Wesleyans cannot be said to be chargeable with schism, "because schism means division *in* a Church, and not separation *from it;*" and that therefore they have nothing to regret.

I should have thought that if a rent *in* a Church were a sin, a rent *from* it was a greater one.

But I had rather reply to this allegation by words of great and good men, than my own. The original word, which is used in the New Testament by St. Jude (*v.* 19) concerning those of whom he speaks so severely, means separatists *from* the Church. St. Cyprian says (Epist. 65), "Schisma est, quum *de Ecclesiâ* receditur, et altare foris collocatur," and St. Jerome thus writes (in Epist. Paul. ad Tit. c. iii.)—"Schisma *ab Ecclesiâ* separatur."

It has also been said by some, that the doctrine of *Apostolic Succession* on which I lay stress in the following Pastoral (pp. 389—392), is a fable, and Wesley is quoted in support of that statement.[2] If so, it is a fable which was believed and

[2] Wesley's Works (Lond. 1812), vol. xv. p. 245. But in the same sentence he adds, "This does in no wise interfere with my remaining in the Church of England, from which I have no more desire to separate than I had fifty years ago. I still attend all the ordinances of the Church at all opportunities, and I constantly and earnestly desire all that are connected with me so to do." This was written in 1785, only six years before his death. He said in 1755 (Works, xvi. p. 4), "It is not clear to us that Presbyters, so circumstanced as we are, may appoint or ordain

acted upon for fifteen centuries by the Church of Christ Universal—which is His Body and Spouse (Eph. i. 23), "the Pillar and Ground of the Truth," "the House of the Living God," (1 Tim. iii. 15), to which He promised His presence even to the end (Matt. xxviii. 20), and the gift of the Holy Ghost to teach her all things, and to guide her into all truth (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13), and to abide with her for ever (John xiv. 6); and, therefore, if she was deceived in this, Christ's promise has failed; and the Holy Ghost has not done the work for which He was sent. Surely no thoughtful and devout Christian will entertain such a supposition as this; but will reject it with indignation and abhorrence as an insult to our adorable Redeemer, and to God the Holy Ghost the Comforter.

Let me assure you that if the Church of England were to be so ill-advised as to give up her claim to "Apostolical Succession," the person who would most exult and triumph at such a surrender on our part, would be the Bishop of Rome.

Again, it has been urged that John Wesley was of opinion that Presbyters or Priests have equal power to ordain with Bishops. Be it so. Then he was very singular in that opinion. It was the opinion of Aerius and Colluthus, and was condemned by the Church of Christ Universal. But let me be pardoned for adding, that even if this were true, it would not serve the Wesleyan cause. The *present Wesleyan Ministers have not even Presbyterian ordination.* In the Wesleyan Conference of 1792, it was resolved that the title

others." In 1738, when he was asked at Bath by what authority he preached, his reply was, "By the authority of Jesus Christ, conveyed to me by him who is now Archbishop of Canterbury, when he laid his hands upon me and said, 'Take thou authority to preach the Gospel.'" (Tyerman's Life of Wesley, i. 238). And in 1745, he thus wrote in his own name, and in that of his brother, the Rev. Charles Wesley, "We believe that it would not be right for us to administer either Baptism or the Lord's Supper unless we had a Commission from those Bishops whom we apprehend to be in a succession from the Apostles. We believe that the three-fold order of Ministers is not only authorized by its apostolic institution, but also by the Written Word." (Tyerman's Life of Wesley, i. 496. This valuable biography is by a distinguished member of the Wesleyan body).

of "*Reverend*" should not be assumed by Wesleyan Preachers,[3] and that they "might not wear gowns or bands,"

[3] Peirce, Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists, p. 278, Lond. 1873. This is an official work, published by the Wesleyan Conference. I may here take an opportunity of saying that when I was requested by a Wesleyan Minister to overrule the decision of a clergyman of this Diocese (the Vicar of Owston Ferry), I declined to do so. The title of *reverend* then claimed by the Wesleyan Minister was not asked for as a compliment, or as a matter of personal courtesy from one private individual to another, but was demanded as an *official right*. It was not merely the thing claimed, but the *animus* with which it was claimed that gave it importance. It was claimed *because* it was the common *title* of the *Clergy*, and because it was supposed to imply that they who have the title are equally *in holy orders* with the Clergy. And it was demanded from the clergyman in question, not as a private individual, but as a minister and representative *of the Church*, and as acting in his public capacity as an authorized Guardian of her *churchyards and churches*.

This controversy was not of my seeking, but it was forced upon me; and being placed in these circumstances I resolved to endeavour to save the *Church* from appearing to recognize publicly, in her own churchyards and churches, Wesleyan Preachers as having the same title with her Clergy (that very title which the Wesleyan Conference itself formerly *forbad* those Preachers to assume *because* it *is* the title of the Clergy), and to acknowledge them as possessing an equal right with the Clergy of the Church, to administer the Sacraments; and also to save the members of the Church (over whose souls I am appointed to watch, and for whom I must give an account at the Great Day) from the danger of confounding their own duly ordained Ministers with others of the innumerable Sects in this country, who have no valid Ordination; and I hoped also to lead the ministers of Nonconformist bodies, especially of our Wesleyan brethren, to examine into their own credentials; so that they might be rescued from what appears to me to be a false and perilous position.

In the present case, the effects of speaking the truth in love have already in many respects been greatly blessed; and I trust that this will be seen more to be the case. If the feelings of any have been hurt by what I did, I am sorry for it; but the wise man says, that "faithful are the wounds of a friend" (Prov. xxvii. 6), and "he that rebuketh a man, shall afterwards find more favour than he that flattereth with his tongue" (Prov. xxviii. 23). The Judicial Committee of Privy Council, which pronounced Judgment in this case (which was an undefended suit) on January 21, 1876, held that the title in question was "not a title of honour or of dignity" (I quote the official Report), "but a laudatory and complimentary epithet, a mark of respect and of reverence, as the name imports, *but nothing more*." This was not the view taken by the Church Courts below. The Privy Council did *not recognize* the claimant of the title as being *in holy orders*, and it said, that the ascription of that title is not to

and it was not till 1836 (in the Conference at Birmingham), that the "laying on of hands"[4] was adopted by them. And, therefore (though I shall be said, I fear, to stir up strife), I am bound to declare that no well-instructed Christian for the first fifteen hundred years after Christ would have thought it safe to receive the Holy Communion at their hands.

Wesleyans either respect John Wesley, or they do not. If they do, they must acknowledge that their own Ordinations are invalid, and that the Sacraments ministered by their Preachers are irregular. For John Wesley never supposed that persons could ordain, who are neither Bishops nor Priests; but their Preachers have not been ordained either by Bishops or Priests.

But if they do not respect John Wesley, ought they to call themselves Wesleyans? and can they retain those chapels which were built by him on the condition that they who held them should conform to his opinions? Might not those chapels be claimed by persons, genuine Wesleyans, who cleave to Wesleyanism in that form in which John Wesley established it?

As to the *ordination* of Wesleyans, an appeal has been made in its favour to Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, a juvenile work, which he himself retracted,[5] (see Bp. Burnet's *Own Time*, i. p. 325,) and all that can be said of it is, that it did not condemn *presbyterian* orders;—which the *Wesleyans have not*. Let me add, that one of the most saintly and wise men that Scotland ever produced, Robert Leighton (afterwards Archbishop of Glasgow), and one of the holiest and most learned

be regarded as a recognition of Ordination. This may be a relief to some. Whether the Church in her own churchyards and churches ought to be required to recognize with a mark of respect and reverence, and with "a laudatory and complimentary epithet, a mark of respect and reverence," the teachers of the numerous and diverse sects whom in her Ecclesiastical Laws she feels it her duty to warn and to censure (see Canons of 1603, Can. 9, 10, 11), is another question, which deserves consideration.

[4] Ibid. p. 279.

[5] See Bp. Burnet's Own Time, i. 325, ed. Oxf. 1823, and Stillingfleet's own avowal, in his Unreasonableness of Separation, p. lxxii, and in his Ecclesiastical Cases, i. pp. 5—9.

men of Lincolnshire, Simon Patrick (afterwards Bishop of Ely), having already Presbyterian orders, thought it right to receive Episcopal Ordination. No one need be ashamed to imitate such examples as those.

Much might be said in excuse of non-episcopal communities in countries where Episcopacy does not exist, or where the Church enforces sinful terms of communion, as the Church of Rome does. But this plea cannot be alleged in England on behalf of Wesleyanism, such as it has *now become*, since the days of Wesley, and in spite of his commands. It sets up a priesthood,—for the administration of the Sacraments,—against the priesthood of the Church of England. This (I say it with sorrow), if done wilfully, is the essence of schism. Some persons have recently urged it to do this the more, in reprisals to the following Pastoral. If it does so, it will prove more clearly that the Pastoral was needed.

But, brethren, I am fully aware that much of the separation, to which I have referred, is the result rather of circumstances of birth, education, and society, than to deliberate convictions. There is not sufficient room in our churches in our great towns for the population; the number and endowments of our Clergy are inadequate.

But here is another reason for conference and co-operation. If the Wesleyans would unite with us in an earnest endeavour to maintain the true faith, and to contend earnestly for it against unbelief, superstition, and vice, how great and glorious would be the result.

But as it is now, the Church of Rome points with scorn to our religious divisions, and triumphs over what she calls the chaotic confusion of our discordant Protestantism, as bearing more resemblance to a Babel, the Tower of Confusion, than to Zion, the City of Peace. And thus she draws many to herself. Not the arguments of Rome, which are unsound, but the divisions of Protestants, which are sinful, make Romanists.

And, on the other side also, the Unbeliever says to us, "First go and agree among yourselves, as to what the Truth is, and then come and preach to us—but not till then."

Thus, brethren, Romanism and Infidelity gain by our religious divisions; and moral depravity, insubordination, and anarchy, and all their calamitous consequences, public and private, are threatening to rend asunder the fabric of civil society, and to involve England in confusion and ruin.

For the sake, therefore, of England and of Christendom, I pray for the friendly Conference of those who are separated, and who ought to be united as brethren in Christ.

It would be premature to express an opinion here as to the terms of agreement that might be arranged between the Church of England and the Wesleyans. For my own part, however, I have no hesitation in saying that I would consent to such conditions as John Wesley himself would have approved: and which may be gathered from his own works, and from quotations in these pages.

What the result of the present appeal may be, God only knows. It has been said by some that the Wesleyan Society is immovably rooted in its present position. But I have seen enough to convince me, that whatever may be the case with *the Society itself as a whole*, there are very many *members* of it, and not a few *preachers* in it, who are not satisfied with their present condition, and who are looking earnestly to the Church; and very many, in my own knowledge, have recently joined it, and many others at this time are preparing to do so.

I have been told that I ought not to busy myself with the affairs of Wesleyans, but to employ myself in attending to the work of my own Diocese, and to be "putting my own house in order, which is tumbling about my ears."

Let me then be permitted to say—since I am constrained to speak of myself, as St. Paul was, by accusations of others, so that he becomes, he says, "a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me" (2 Cor. xii. 11)—that, while conscious of many short-comings, I have endeavoured to attend to the affairs of this Diocese, and may I be allowed to add, with feelings of devout thankfulness to God, from Whom, and from Whom alone, all strength comes of body and mind, that I have been enabled by Him in the present year to hold Confirmations in numerous places, and to hold Visitations in

almost every part of the Diocese, and that (as I have said in the Pastoral), I regard the Wesleyans as forming a very considerable part of the population of this Diocese, and that in addressing them, I was attending to the affairs of the Diocese in a very important respect.

As to the danger of our house falling about our ears, I am fully aware that it needs a good deal of care, and may be greatly strengthened, improved, and beautified; and that the Wesleyans might do much to help us in this good work. But here, again, let us thank God for His mercy. I trust that our house is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the head corner-stone (Eph. ii. 20). I believe it to be built upon Christ, Who is the rock (Matt. xvi. 18); and while it remains steadfast on that foundation, it will not fall (Matt. vii. 25).

As to the work of Christ in this Diocese, let me only mention a single specimen of it. Nearly 100 Churches have been either restored or built in the Diocese in the last three years. This does not look as if the house were tumbling about our ears. To God be all the praise!

Pastoral to the Wesleyans.

Tuesday in Whitsun Week, 1873.

This holy season, Whitsuntide, in which we bless God for the Coming of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, Peace, and Love, prompts me to do so. I have just completed a Visitation of this Diocese; and I cannot overlook you who form so large and important a part of it. I pray God to heal our divisions. My heart yearns for union with you. You often bring your children to be confirmed by me. In how many things are we united with you, and you with us. You have the same Bible with ourselves; and in many respects the same Prayer Book. Your Service Book is derived from our Liturgy.[6] We have the same Creed. In

[6] See "The Sunday Service of the Methodists and other Occasional Services." London: Mason, 1842.

how many things are we with you, and you with us. And why not in all?

Ever since the commencement of my connexion with the Diocese of Lincoln, in which Wesleyanism had its origin, and in which it largely prevails, I have longed to address you, and to speak to you "the truth in love" (Eph. iv. 15). One of the first Confirmations which I held in this Diocese, in the Spring of 1869, was at Epworth, where John Wesley was born one hundred and seventy years ago. In the churchyard, on the south side of the chancel, is the grave-stone of his venerable father, Samuel Wesley, thirty-nine years Rector of that Parish, who, as the epitaph on it declares, died, as he had lived, "in the true Catholic Faith of the Undivided and Ever-Blessed Trinity, and of the Godhead of Jesus Christ." On that stone John Wesley stood and preached.

When I visited Epworth, in 1869, I was informed that no Confirmation had been held in that important Parish (the population of which is more than 2000) since the 22nd August, 1686, when the Bishop of Peterborough of that day confirmed there; and it is recorded, that on that occasion a multitude of persons, about a thousand in number, was gathered together to be confirmed at once.

Is it surprising that in such a state of things Wesleyanism should have arisen?

In the course of several tours of Confirmation and Visitation from Parish to Parish in that and succeeding years, I have observed that in almost every one, especially in North Lincolnshire, Methodism presents itself in two forms, and often in three, viz. Wesleyan Methodism, Free Methodism, and Primitive Methodism.

This suggests serious reflections.

Brethren, if your revered founder, John Wesley, were to rise from his grave, what would his feelings be? what would be his language? If he stood once more on his father's grave at Epworth, inscribed with that profession of faith to which I have referred; and if he looked down upon the town lying on the west beneath the churchyard, there he would see a large building of red brick, in which a religious

sect assembles for worship, which has split off from the Wesleyans—the sect of Kilhamites.[7] And if he extended his contemplation to the neighbouring country, he would see in almost every village one or more places of worship frequented by persons who bear the name of Methodists, but who dissent, not only from the Church of England, but from the Methodism of John Wesley.

Suffer me also to inquire, Whether, even as to Wesleyanism itself, as it is now, he would acknowledge it as his own work? Would John Wesley be a Wesleyan? John Wesley acknowledged only one Church in this country, the Church of England. In 1790 he thus wrote: "I never had any design of separating from the Church. I have no such design now. I declare that I live and die a Member of the Church of England; and that none who regard my judgment will ever separate from it."[8] "We do not, and will not form any separate sect; but from principle we will remain what we always have been, true members of the Church of England."[9] He did not allow his disciples to call themselves "Dissenters."[1] He would not permit his preachers to license themselves "as dissenters, but as Methodist preachers."[2] In the "Code of Directions" drawn up by him, and given to his preachers, as "the Rules by which they were to walk," and which are described by the Wesleyan Conference in 1797 as "the Rules to which they consented when they were admitted," are the following instructions:—"How should an Assistant be qualified for his charge?—By loving the Church of England, and by resolving not to separate from it. Let this be well observed. I fear that when the Methodists leave the Church, God will

[7] In the description of Epworth, in White's Directory of Lincolnshire, p. 440, ed. 1872, it is stated that Mr. Alexander Kilham, the founder of the "New Connection," was also a native of this parish, and died in 1798, after fighting hard against what he regarded as the "priestly domination of the Wesleyan Conference."

[8] John Wesley, in the Arminian Magazine, quoted in p. 172 of Mr. Urlin's volume on John Wesley's Place in Church History. London, 1870.

[9] Wesley's Sermons, i. 575.

[1] Ibid.

[2] Minutes, A.D. 1772, vol. i. p. 541.

leave them. O, use every means to prevent this. (1) Exhort all our people to keep close to the Church and Sacrament. (2) *Warn them* all *against* niceness in hearing—a prevailing evil. (3) *Warn them* against despising the prayers of the Church; (4) *against* calling our Society '*a Church;*' (5) against calling our preachers '*Ministers;*' our houses 'Meeting Houses:' call them plain '*Preaching Houses.*'"

These "Minutes" were delivered to Wesleyan Preachers on their admission to the office, and these Preachers were then told that they would "be acknowledged as fellow-labourers in the cause as long as they freely consented to these rules, and earnestly endeavoured to walk by them." [3]

John Wesley was the founder of an Order of *Lay Preachers*. This was his special work. He desired to *supplement* the Church, not to *supplant* it. He had no intention of setting up an independent Priesthood in opposition to that of the Church, for the ministry of the Sacraments. He expressly disclaimed any such intention. Hear his words:[4]—

"In 1744 all the Methodist Preachers held their first Conference. But none of them dreamed that the being called to *preach* gave them any right to *administer Sacraments*. And when that question was proposed, 'In what light are we to consider ourselves?' It was answered, 'As *extraordinary messengers*, raised up to provoke the *ordinary* ones to jealousy.' In order hereto, one of our first rules was, given to each Preacher, 'You are to do *that part* of the work which we appoint.' But *what work* was this? Did we ever appoint you to *administer Sacraments, to exercise the Priestly Office? Such a design never entered into our mind; it was the farthest from our thoughts.* And if any Preacher had taken such a step, we should have looked upon it as a palpable breach of this rule, and consequently as a recantation of our connexion.

"For supposing (what I utterly deny) that the receiving you as a Preacher, at the same time gave an authority to

[3] Chronicles of Wesleyan Methodism, i. p. vii, pp. 78—80, 88.

[4] The Rev. John Wesley: in his Sermon preached at Cork, 4th May, 1789, and printed by him in his Arminian Magazine for 1790.

administer the Sacraments; yet, it gave you no other authority than to do it, or anything else, where I appoint. But where did I appoint you to do this? Nowhere at all. Therefore, by this very rule you are excluded from doing it. And in doing it you renounce the first principle of Methodism, which was *wholly and solely to preach the gospel.*

"It was several years after our Society was formed, before any attempt of this kind was made. The first was, I apprehend, at Norwich. One of our Preachers there, yielded to the importunity of a few of the people, and baptized their children. But as soon as it was known, he was informed it must not be, unless he designed to leave our connexion. He promised to do it no more: and I suppose he kept his promise.

"Now, so long as the Methodists keep to this plan, they cannot separate from the Church. And this is our peculiar glory. It is new upon the earth. Revolve all the histories of the Church, from the earliest ages, and you will find, whenever there was a great work of God in any particular city or nation, the subjects of that work soon said to their neighbours, 'Stand by yourselves, for we are holier than you!' As soon as ever they separated themselves, either they retired into deserts, or they built religious houses; or at least formed parties, into which none was admitted but such as subscribed both to their judgment and practice. But with the Methodists, it is quite otherwise. They are not a Sect or Party. They do not separate from the Religious Community to which they at first belonged. They are still members of the Church; such they desire to live and to die. And I believe, one reason why God is pleased to continue my life so long, is to confirm them in their present purpose, *Not to separate from the Church.*

"I wish all of you who are vulgarly termed Methodists, would seriously consider what has been said. And particularly you, whom God has commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no *means follow from hence that ye are commissioned to baptize, or to administer the Lord's Supper.* Ye never dreamed of this, for ten or twenty years

after ye began to preach. Ye did not then, like *Korah, Dathan,* and *Abiram, seek the Priesthood also* (Num. xvi. 10). Ye knew that "No man *taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron*" (Heb. v. 4) O contain yourselves within your own bounds. Be content with preaching the Gospel. *Do the work of Evangelists.* Proclaim to all the world the loving-kindness of God our Saviour; declare to all, *The kingdom of heaven is at hand: repent ye, and believe the Gospel.* I earnestly advise you, abide in your place: keep your own station. Ye were, fifty years ago, those of you that were then *Methodist Preachers, extraordinary Messengers* of God, not going in your own will, but *thrust out,* not to supersede, but to *provoke to jealousy* the *ordinary messengers.* In God's name, stop there! Both by your preaching and example, provoke them to love and good works. Ye are a new phenomenon in the earth; a body of people who, being of no sect or party, are friends to all parties, and endeavour to forward all, in Heart religion, in the knowledge and love of God and man. Ye yourselves were at first called in the Church of England; and though ye have, and will have, a thousand temptations to leave it, and set up for yourselves, regard them not. Be Church of England men still. Do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which God raised you up."

Such are John Wesley's words. I beseech you, ponder them well.

After Wesley's death, his intimate friend and biographer, Dr. Whitehead, who was appointed to preach his funeral sermon,[5] was chosen also to write his epitaph, which was placed on a marble tablet in the New Chapel in the City Road; and in that epitaph John Wesley was described (*in words now erased*) as "the founder of the Methodist *Societies*" (they are not called *churches*) and as "the Patron and Friend of *Lay Preachers.*"[6] He regarded his Preachers as Laymen.

[5] Wesley was born June 17, 1703, and died March 2, 1791.

[6] The Epitaph may be seen in Wesley's Works, vi. 263, and in Peirce, p. 5. The following words were also inscribed on his Tomb:—"This great light arose by the singular providence of God to enlighten these

In the year 1793, two years after Wesley's death, the Conference put forth certain Minutes, in which it is said that "the Wesleyan teachers are only preachers and expounders of God's Holy Word," and that "the attempts that have been lately made to introduce the *Ordination Scheme*, have produced many and great evils in various places, and if persisted in must divide the people, and in the end destroy the cause. We, therefore, stand forward to declare our intention of abiding by and supporting the original Methodist plan."

It is much to be desired, that another John Wesley might arise to preach a sermon on Wesleyanism. He would say in plain words, derived from Holy Scripture, that wilful schism is a deadly sin, that it is a work of the flesh, and that to be carnally minded is death. He would say that the essence of schism (which means *division*) is to make a separation or rent in a Church, or from a Church; that it consists in setting up altar against altar, and priesthood against priesthood; and in assuming a right to minister in holy things, such as the Sacraments of the Church, without a due call and mission. He would declare that "no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4). He would remind you, that Korah and his company, (to whom John Wesley refers in the sermon which I have quoted) who were Levites, and invaded the Priest's office, were consumed by fire from God—(Num. xvi. 35), and that St. Jude,[7] warns Christian men, under the Gospel dispensation, against the commission of this sin, lest they incur hereafter a punishment like that of those who "perished in the gainsaying of Korah." These are awful words; but they are spoken in love.

Would not John Wesley entreat you, as you value your everlasting salvation, to consider carefully, whether you are guilty of this sin; or abet others in committing it; lest you fall into the same condemnation?

You may perhaps say in reply, that God has visibly

nations, and to revive, enforce, and defend the *pure Apostolic doctrines and practices of the Primitive Church.*" (Works, vi. 262, Peirce, p. 5).

[7] Jude 11.

blessed the work of those who minister the Sacraments in your congregations. We do not deny it. But are they, therefore, safe who minister? The Israelites were refreshed by the water flowing from the rock struck by Moses; but he was excluded from Canaan for striking it (Num. xx. 12). Balaam and Caiaphas prophesied of Christ, and many have been edified by their prophecies; but nevertheless they who prophesied were objects of God's wrath. St. Paul rejoiced that Christ was preached, although some who preached Him "*preached in strife*" (Phil. i. 15), but yet the same Apostle says, "Let *nothing* be done through *strife*" (Phil. ii. 3); and St. James declares (James iii. 14—16) that "where there is *strife*, there is *every evil work*," and, "if ye have *strife* in your hearts, this wisdom is *earthly, sensual, devilish*." St. Paul did not rejoice in their strife, but in the Gospel of Truth and Unity, which they preached. And how much more would he have rejoiced, if they had preached it in unity! God often elicits good from evil, and overrules evil for good; but evil is not the less evil on that account. God brought about the greatest good, namely, the Salvation of the World, from the greatest sin, the Crucifixion of Christ.

We do not deny that persons who resort to schismatical Teachers and Ministers, and receive the Sacraments at their hands, but who are not wilfully partakers of their schism, or even conscious of it, may derive benefit from God's Word and Sacraments ministered by those Teachers and Ministers; but this does not in any way diminish the guilt of those who schismatically preach and minister, or who knowingly and wilfully abet and encourage them in their teaching and ministrations.

It is also said by some persons, that they deem it right to go to any place of worship whatsoever, where they may "get the most good;" and that they go a Meeting-house, "because they get more good there than in Church." I do not doubt that *they think* that they get more good there than in a Church. But, my friends, we shall be judged hereafter, not according to what *we think*, but according to what *God says*. And if God says in His Word,—as He certainly does,—that schism is a deadly sin; then we shall

not be saved by thinking that we are wiser than God, and that He was mistaken in saying so. No: the Word that He has spoken to us, "*that* will judge us in the Last Day" (John xii. 48). "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" (Prov. xiv. 12).

But it may be alleged by some, that, if this reasoning is correct, then the Church of England is guilty of sin for separating herself from the Church of Rome; and it may be asked, "If the Church of England is right in separating herself from the Church of Rome, are the Wesleyans wrong in separating themselves from the Church of England?"

Yes, brethren, they are; and let me tell you the reason.

The Church of Rome not merely teaches many great and grievous errors, at variance with Holy Scripture, and with the doctrines of the ancient Catholic Church, but she endeavours to *impose* those errors upon all men; and she will not hold communion with any one who will not communicate with her in those unscriptural and anti-scriptural errors. She makes communion in her errors to be essential to communion with herself. She excommunicates all who will not accept her errors; and thus she is guilty of the sin of the schism between the Church of England and herself. Wilful schism is always a deadly sin. But the guilt lies with those who *commit* the sin, and who *cause* the separation, not with those who *suffer* from its commission.

Brethren, believe me, it will not be enough for you to show that there are evil men and evil ministers in the Church of England, and that some in her communion are semi-rationalists or semi-Romanists; it would not even be enough for you to show that the Church of England connives at errors in doctrine, discipline, and worship. Even if all these things could be proved, they would not justify you in separating from her, and in making divisions in her. No Church on earth is free from manifold imperfections. Tares grow up among the wheat, till the harvest. There are bad fish together with good fish in the net; goats with sheep in the flock; chaff with good grain on the threshing-floor; unfruitful branches with fruitful on the Vine, in every

visible Church on earth. And so it will be till the end of the world; and then a severance will be made. But prove to us, if you can, that the Church of England has not the Holy Scriptures in her hands; prove to us that she has not the Creeds of the ancient Catholic Church; prove to us that she does not minister the Holy Sacraments by *that form* of Church Government which, and *which alone*, for fifteen hundred years was known and accepted by the Universal Church of Christ, to which He promised His continual presence and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost to "teach her all things," and to "guide her into all truth" (John xiv. 16, 26; xvi. 13); namely, by the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; prove to us that she *imposes* and *enforces* heretical doctrines, contrary to Holy Scripture and to the teaching of the primitive Church, and then you will have said something to palliate what you must allow me to call the sin of separation from her—but *not till then*.

Where, then, is the remedy?

First, in prayer to God for the outpouring of His Holy Spirit upon us, that He will "give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions; and that He will take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord; that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God; through Jesus Christ our Lord." [8]

Next, let the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church humble themselves before God, and confess their sins, and pray for pardon and grace from Him. If the Bishops and Clergy of England—especially in her Provincial and Diocesan Synods—had taken counsel together how to guide the great religious movement set on foot by John Wesley, it might, by God's providence, have been controlled and regulated, and have done much to quicken the spiritual life of

[8] Prayer for Unity; in the Book of Common Prayer.

the Church, and to increase her pastoral and ministerial efficiency, and have conduced to the advancement of His glory and the diffusion of His truth, and to the salvation of souls; and the evil effects which have proceeded from it might have been averted.

But the opportunity was lost; and now we mourn over the loss.

The Laity also of the Church of England have their share of responsibility. As we have said, Wesleyanism was due in great measure to Pluralities and Non-residence of the Clergy; and pluralities and non-residence were due to the poverty of our parochial Cures, and to the want of Parsonages. Even at the present time the clerical income of one-ninth of the benefices in Lincolnshire is not more than 100*l.* a year; and the income of one-third is not more than 200*l.* a year. And more than 30,000*l.* a year of the Tithes of this Diocese are in the hands of laymen.

Let the Laity of the Church be entreated to remember that all property is held in trust from God and for God; and that He has said in His Holy Word that it is held in trust for certain purposes, one of the first of which is the maintenance of the Christian Ministry (Gal. vi. 6. 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14) for the salvation of souls. Can Lay impropriators of tithes be at ease in their consciences, can large Proprietors and Capitalists look forward with any comfort to the Great Day of reckoning (when they will be called upon by the Judge of all to give an account of their stewardship), if, while they themselves are living in affluence, many of the Clergy in Parishes where they themselves reside, or where they have property,—perhaps tithe property,—are left to pine in poverty; and if all the evils, spiritual and temporal, are allowed to remain unabated, which prevail in our Parishes from the indigence of their Ministers? "Every Man," (says Lord Bacon) "owes to God a tenth of His substance." Let the Laity, for Christ's sake, remember these things. Let them do their duty in this respect, and they will reap an abundant harvest, even in this world; and how blessed will be their recompense in the life which is to come!

Next, let me be permitted to exhort and entreat those,

who are Wesleyan Methodists, to consider their own position, as in the sight of God, Who searcheth the hearts, and Who has revealed His Will in His Word, and Who will judge us all. Listen not to me, but to God, Who declares that wilful schism is a sin—a deadly sin; and that Unity is a great good, which all Christians must desire to attain and hold fast. Consider with yourselves, whether Christ did not promise to be always with His Church even to the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20), and to send to her the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, to teach her all things, and to guide her into all truth, and to abide with her for ever (John xiv. 16, 26; xvi. 13). And then ask yourselves this question—Can these promises of Christ have been fulfilled (as assuredly they must have been, for He is the Truth), *if* the Church of Christ did *not know* for fifteen centuries *what* ought to be her own form of government in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and *if* it was left for men in the eighteenth century after Christ to discover it? Can we imagine that the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit of God, have failed in their Word and Work? This is impossible. Such a supposition must be repudiated with indignation by all faithful Christians, as an insult to the Son of God, and as an outrage against the Spirit of God. Well, then, Can you yourselves be safe, either in ministering the Sacraments without a due mission and ordination to minister them (in opposition to the uniform judgment and practice of the Universal Church of Christ for fifteen centuries), or in abetting and encouraging any who minister them without such mission and ordination, and in receiving the Sacraments at their hands? I think not. And as one who desires your everlasting salvation, I earnestly exhort and implore you to examine these things well, as in the presence of God; and, whatever sacrifice it may cost you, to act accordingly. Inquire whether it be not true, that the Universal Church for fifteen hundred years after Christ believed that none but Bishops could confer Holy Orders. Inquire whether the Church did not condemn the contrary opinion when broached by Aerius.[9] Ask whether it be not true,

[9] S. Augustin. de Hæres. § 53. Epiphanius, de Hæret, 75.

that what is called the "Apostolical Succession of Ministers" has been actually continued from the Apostolic age? and whether this may not be reasonably inferred from the fact that the Church knew that it was necessary for her to provide for herself persons to minister the Word and Sacraments; and that she did *not know* of *any other* way of providing them than by Episcopal Ordination? In our Book of Common Prayer, which declares the Law of the Church of England, for which John Wesley ever expressed the greatest reverence, are the following words:[1]—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that *from the Apostles' time* there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—*Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;* which Offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by Publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And, therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in the United Church of *England* and *Ireland*, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly *Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.*" Also by the Act of Uniformity (Sect. 14) a person who is only a Deacon (*i.e.* who has not been ordained *Priest* by a Bishop and other Priests) is liable to a heavy penalty if he presumes to consecrate and administer the Holy Communion.

And further, may I not venture to inquire, whether even in secular respects the present position of Methodism is secure? If I rightly apprehend the matter, the tenure of its places of worship depends on the fulfilment of certain prescribed terms and stipulations. The Holy Scriptures, as explained in the *Sermons of John Wesley* and in his *Notes on the*

[1] Book of Common Prayer—Preface to the Ordination Service.

New Testament, are its standards of doctrine and discipline, and its places of worship are held on the condition of conformity to those standards.[2] To quote the Minutes of Conference itself (vol. i. p. 417), "The chapels were to be held in trust for the sole use of such persons as might be appointed at the yearly Conference of the people called Methodists, *provided* that *the said persons preached no other doctrines than those contained in Wesley's Notes on the New Testament, and in his four volumes of Sermons.*" I have quoted extracts from his Sermons, and from other of his works. Might it not even be alleged, that the Wesleyans incur the danger of losing their own places of worship, if they drift away from what their Founder has repeatedly affirmed in the clearest and most solemn tones in those very works which are the code and charter of your Society.

But in saying this, let me add in Christian Truth and Love, that we ourselves in the Church of England have need of you, and that you have need of us. "Sirs, ye are brethren, why do ye wrong one to another?" (Acts vii. 26). We love you for your zeal: and there is much in your organization that we admire. You and we have common enemies, who desire our destruction; Satan and Sin, the World and the flesh. We have formidable foes leagued against us; Secularism, Unbelief, and Romanism. Why do we not unite in doing battle against them, and in contending earnestly for the faith? Our separation has lasted too long already, and if it continues, it will widen itself still more. How many discordant forms of Methodism already exist! But if our separation could be healed, how much would the holy angels rejoice, and what blessings would accrue to us and to countless myriads of souls in time and eternity, from our union!

I may be mistaken, but this union, of which I speak, is not impracticable; and if we would resolve not to contend for our own private opinions, but for the Truth as revealed in God's Word, and as declared by the consent and practice of the ancient Church of Christ, and would conform to that standard, the solution of the problem would be easy.

[2] See John Wesley's Journal, Sept. 5, 1783; Peirce, p. 265, 269; Tyerman's Life of Wesley, iii. 417.

Let me be allowed to invite you to a friendly Conference on these matters; and in doing so, let me advert to some details.

You have your "Lay Preachers." We in the Church of England have our "Lay Readers." Might not these two orders be united? Your Founder, John Wesley, declared with his dying breath that he did not dissent in anything from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; he died in the Communion of the Church; and he solemnly conjured his followers never to separate from it. In the present address to Wesleyans I am only echoing the words of John Wesley, and of his wise and saintly brother, the Rev. Charles Wesley, who, "hoped and prayed that Methodism would merge in the Church, and that a Bishop would be found *to confer ordination on its preachers.*"[3] He being dead yet speaketh (Heb. xi. 4). Will you not listen to his voice?

I do not indeed forget, that, in the year 1784—and not till then—when Wesley was more than eighty years of age, and when he had attempted in vain to obtain ordination for some of his preachers from the English Episcopate, he took upon himself to appoint two of them to America; and (in opposition to the earnest remonstrance of his brother Charles Wesley) he gave a commission to Dr. Coke (who was also a Presbyter of the Church of England, and who afterwards desired to be consecrated[4] a Bishop by American Bishops, and to be consecrated to the See of Calcutta), to "superintend" the Wesleyan Society in that country.[5]

John Wesley represented these acts as exceptional acts, and as necessitated by circumstances; but it cannot be denied that they were infractions of Church discipline; and

[3] See Jackson's Memoirs of the Rev. C. Wesley, pp. 266, 306, 426, 473, cited by Urlin, p. 110.

Tyerman, iii. 434.

[5] Both Wesley and Coke were Presbyters of the Church of England; and Dr. Whitehead, Wesley's biographer, said truly, "Dr. Coke had the same authority to ordain Mr. Wesley that Mr. Wesley had to ordain Dr. Coke." Wesley (says Mr. Tyerman, iii. 430), we think, never intended doing this, but at Dr. Coke's request he acquiesced. Wesley never gave him the title of Bishop. (Tyerman, iii. 437.)

that he thus involved himself in embarrassment, and placed himself in an attitude of inconsistency and self-contradiction, and exposed himself to the charge of doing that very thing which he most deprecated and condemned, namely, of separating himself from the Church. He set aside the judicious counsels of his pious brother,[6] Charles Wesley. He took a false step; and he was next led on to "yield to the judgment of others" (as he himself expressed it), and to appoint three preachers to minister the Sacraments in Scotland. It has been affirmed by some writers, that he was carried on still further, and was prevailed upon to appoint three of his preachers to minister also in England. But this is doubtful. In fact, after Wesley's death, the Trustees of the principal Wesleyan places of worship in London and Bristol, made the following statement to the Wesleyan Conference in 1793:[7]—"Although Mr. Wesley, *by dint of importunity*, towards the close of his life was prevailed upon to ordain a few of his preachers for *America and Scotland*, he by no means intended to extend it or make it general."

This declaration is corroborated by Dr. Whitehead, Wesley's biographer, who says that Wesley was prevailed on to ordain, against his own judgment; and who contravenes the assertion that Wesley intended any of his ordinations for England.[8] Even, therefore, if it could be conceded that *Presbyters* are qualified to ordain (a theory repugnant to the judgment of the Universal Church for 1500 years), and even though Wesley, who was a Presbyter of the Church, may be appealed to, in a certain limited sense, for such an opinion as that; yet suffer me to say, it would by no means follow that Wesleyan Ministers have been duly ordained (for they do not possess presbyterian orders), or that they can rightly minister the Sacraments to you, or that you can safely receive the Sacraments at their hands; or that they and you can justly appeal to John Wesley for any sanction or countenance in doing so.

But, brethren, what are men, that we should refer to them?

[6] See Tyerman, iii. 439—447.

[7] See Urlin, p. 162.

[8] Ibid. 164.

let me not speak to you of John Wesley, but of Jesus Christ. Let me affectionately entreat you, to remember the words of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, Who has purchased to Himself His Universal Church by His own Blood, and Who will judge us all at the Great Day, and Who thus prayed for His disciples: "As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that they may be One, even as We are One" (John xvii. 21, 22).

I am, beloved brethren in Christ,

Yours faithfully,

C. LINCOLN.

ON THE BURIALS QUESTION.

Let me be allowed to place here on record what was said by me on this subject at the Lincoln Diocesan Conference, *Friday, October* 5, 1877.

I trust that we are all ready to give respectful attention to the feelings of our dissenting brethren, and that we are desirous of removing any real grievance from them that we can. But I doubt whether by assenting to Mr. Osborne Morgan's Burials' Bill we should confer any real boon upon them. We find from statistical inquiries that our dissenting brethren generally prefer burial by the Clergy of the Church, with the Church Service, to any other form of interment. For example, in one Cemetery near Lincoln, in a district where are many dissenters, there have been 406 burials on the consecrated side, and only two on the unconsecrated side. But if that Bill were to pass, the religious dissenters would be pressed by political partisans,—eager to seize on our churches by means of our Churchyards,—to reject the ministrations of the Church in our Churchyards for burial by other Ministers.

I believe also that religious dissenters would think that the admission of their own Ministers into English Churchyards would be too dearly purchased, if it were to open the way, as it certainly would, to the desecration of those Churchyards by irreligious services.

We find also that Mr. Osborne Morgan's Bill, which would legalize the unrestricted admission of all Services, even of secularists and unbelievers, in our Churchyards, was supported in Parliament by a large number of Irish Romanists and Scotch Presbyterians; and that the future condition of our English Churchyards may be decided by their votes, although they have no concern with our Churchyards except so far as it is connected with the general question of the Disestablishment of the Church, for which they are strenuous advocates. In fact, to speak plainly, the existence of the Church Establishment is the real grievance with a large number of Mr. Morgan's adherents. A formidable confederacy is now arrayed against the Established Church. I do not say that they are all eager to disestablish it, but I fear that most of them desire to weaken it. The one thing which unites their discordant elements is an attack on the Church. The noble lord who leads the opposition in the House of Lords is well aware of this, and he and his allies are strongly tempted to make use of this question as the rallying-point for combining the scattered forces of the liberal party, and for bringing it back again to political power.

The question, gentlemen, is not, what men, however distinguished, may propose, but what does God command. It seems to me that in the discussions on this question the Person most concerned in it has been almost left out of the account. And who is he? Almighty God. The Church is God's house. The Churchyard is "God's acre." It has been set apart from all common uses, and has been religiously dedicated to God by a solemn act of consecration. It cannot be interfered with, and be applied to uses which He disapproves, without sin. And He is a God of Truth and a God of Unity. He is also a jealous God. Famine, Flood, Pestilence, and War are God's judgments, by which He punishes those Nations which sin against Him. Let us not provoke Him to chastise us with those fearful visitations, by profaning what is holy. Our Blessed Lord, who has "all power in heaven and in earth," twice drove from His presence in anger those who profaned the outer courts of His

Father's House. Can we hope for His blessing, if we desecrate the Churchyards which have been dedicated to God? Churchyards are holy places, and if a nation profanes them, it must expect severe retribution from Him.

Gentlemen, it may perhaps be said, that Mr. Osborne Morgan's Bill, which would give up our Churchyards to secularists and infidels, will not be carried in its largest form, and that Lord Harrowby's Clause, which limits them to services which are "Christian and orderly," will be accepted in its place. I can hardly see how this can be, because, the plea, on which that Clause rests, is that Churchyards do not belong to the Church of England, but *are national property;* and if so, then *secularists and infidels* have an equal claim for admission to them with all other citizens. And who is to prosecute, if those so-called "orderly and Christian" services become unchristian and disorderly? Is the Clergyman to incur the obloquy and expense of doing so? But let that Clause be accepted. Then what would be the consequence? There are more than fifty forms of Dissent in this country; all calling themselves "Christian." First and foremost are the Roman Catholics. It is said, that Romanism is rapidly increasing in this country. I believe that this is so, and that it will increase more—both in numbers and aggressive activity. Well, then, by this Clause the Churchyards of the Church of England will be opened to the pompous ceremonies and religious dogmas of the Church of Rome.

It astonishes me, I confess, to find that many distinguished persons who have lately protested vehemently against Ritualistic practices and Romanizing tendencies in the Church, should now invite the Church of Rome (which will joyfully accept the invitation) to come and officiate in the Churchyards of the Church of England; and should thus be doing what in them lies to destroy the work of the English Reformation. What would Archbishops of Canterbury—such as Archbishop Cranmer, and Archbishop Parker, and Archbishop Whitgift, and Archbishop Laud—have said to such a proposal as this; to throw open our English Churchyards to the Priesthood of the Church of Rome? As to the other

forms of religious dissent, all calling themselves Christian, and all therefore to be received as welcome guests in our English Churchyards, their name is Legion. This I know, that the resolution in question would include those who disbelieve the doctrine of the Resurrection of the dead, and who repudiate the truth of the Atonement, and deny the Divinity of Christ.

Gentlemen, I venture to prophesy, that if this resolution should pass, some who have been its leading advocates, will be among the first to rue the result.

And now it may be asked, What is to be done? We are ready to assent to the closing of many Churchyards, and to the provision of accessible public Cemeteries in every parochial district. But I frankly confess that I have no compromise to offer. I see none that is possible. Some people say you must open your Churchyards to all. You must "accept the inevitable." Gentlemen, what would the martyrs of old—what would our Protestant forefathers have said to such cowardly counsel as that? "Accept the inevitable!" They might have escaped the rack, and the faggot, and the stake, if they had "accepted the inevitable." But where then would have been their fair name on earth, and their glorious reward for Eternity?

No, gentlemen, no man can force the conscience and the will. Some say we shall be beaten. Be it so. But defeat *with* God and the truth is better than victory *without* God and *against* the truth. We may be forced to *suffer* evil, but let us not *do* evil. Of this I am sure, that if we accept a compromise such as is proposed, we shall not avert disestablishment, but shall rather hasten it. The Church of Ireland accepted such a compromise in 1868, and was disestablished in 1869. And in what condition shall we then be? That of a demoralized and broken army. There will be no mutual confidence among us. Many of the Clergy and Laity will say that they have been betrayed by the Bishops, and will be suspicious of them, and be alienated from them. We shall not be able to work together. Bishops will be separated from Clergy, and Clergy from Bishops. We shall be a house divided against itself. But by union in the truth,

we may, with God's help, avert disestablishment; and even if we do not, I have no hesitation in saying that disestablishment with sound principles is far preferable to Establishment without them. Let us endeavour, with God's help, to maintain the truth; and may He defend the right!

The following Resolution on this subject, was moved at the Conference by Sir Charles H. J. Anderson, Bart., and seconded by the Right Rev. the Bishop-Suffragan of Nottingham, and was carried by 113 to 15 :—

"That while this Conference respects the conscientious scruples of others, and is ready to co-operate in any reasonable measures for removing their real grievances, it is of opinion, that the compulsory introduction of other Services than those of the Church of England into her Burial-grounds, would be an infringement of her rights, and an invasion of her property, and an infliction of a grievance on the consciences of her members, and a contravention of those purposes for which her churchyards have been set apart by a solemn act of Consecration."

ON LABOUR AND CAPITAL.

THE present season of distress, in our Agricultural as well as in our Manufacturing districts, may suggest many serious questions, financial and economical, to the politician, the patriot, and the philanthropist.

With these topics I will not meddle; but the crisis, through which we are passing, appears to be forcing on our minds the consideration of other subjects of even greater gravity and deeper interest, which lie at the root of our national prosperity. "Shall there be evil in a city" (asks the Ruler of the World by the prophet),[1] "and the Lord hath not done it?" and by another prophet[2] He says, "The Lord's voice crieth in the city, and the man of wisdom shall see thy name. Hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it."

There can be little doubt that Almighty God is speaking to us in our present national visitations. In the prophet's language, His voice crieth in the city, and it will be our wisdom to hear His voice, and to inquire "Who has appointed the chastisement by which we are suffering, and what is it intended to teach us?"

Is it not true that our present calamities are due in a great measure to what may be called moral failures, and (if we may so speak) moral insolvencies, and to forgetfulness of our religious obligations? It is not undeniable that many have been living a luxurious life of lavish extravagance, and have been vying with one another in ambitious display, without thrift or forethought; and contracting habits of unrestrained self-indulgence, so that when the day of trial arrives, they are unable to meet it? How many foreign markets have been closed against us through

[1] Amos iii. 6.

[2] Micah vi. 9.

dishonest adulteration of our home manufactures. Have we not to acknowledge the prevalence of a spirit of gambling in rash speculation, and in reckless over-production? May it not be, that God is now calling us to a reckoning for violations of His Law, revealed in His Written Word?

These and like questions are now put to us by our present distress; and our calamities may be overruled for future good, if they have the effect of making us look more closely into our own hearts, and of inducing us to test and reform our lives by the standard of His commandments.

There is one aspect of this subject on which I would enlarge by way of illustration of my meaning, as to the salutary, practical influence of Christian principles, on our Agricultural and Commercial welfare, and on our material prosperity; and as showing what we may hope for as a Nation, if we maintain those principles in the training of the rising generation; and also, on the other hand, what results we may expect, socially, politically, and nationally, if we allow Board Schools (as now constituted) to supersede our Church Schools, and if we suffer secular instruction to supersede religious education.

A strife has arisen—a war has broken out—between Labour and Capital. The din of discord is heard in our populous cities—in our factories and foundries, in our mills, workshops, and warehouses, and in our mines; and has even penetrated into the quiet retirement of our rural villages. Labour makes a bold appeal to Capital, and says, "What will your wealth avail you, unless it is made productive by my hands? It will remain inert and unfruitful, like unwrought ore in the mine, or like unhewn marble in the quarry, or like hidden pearls in the ocean." If Capital and Labour are at variance, society will be disorganized and distracted by a struggle disastrous to employers and employed.

What can reconcile them?—Christianity. It has done this work under more difficult circumstances, and can do it again. Let us think of the population of slaves which swarmed in the cities of Greece and Rome in ancient days. They were spoken of by their employers as "living ma-

chines"[3] and "chattels" to be sold by auction; and the consequence was, that, when an opportunity offered, they rose in revolt against their masters, and endangered the safety of the nation by a social and servile war.[4] Heathen Antiquity had bitter experience of something worse than the "strikes" of modern days.

Such was the condition of society when Christianity appeared in the world. How did it deal with this problem? The Apostolic Epistles—especially the Epistles of St. Paul,[5] and notably his Epistle to Philemon—supply an answer to that question.

Christianity did not make itself a political partisan by espousing the claims of one class against the other. It would neither be a parasite of the rich, nor inflame the passions of the poor. It would not act the part of a Publicola or a Spartacus. It would not bid for popularity by flattering the immense multitude of slaves with highly-coloured pictures of their own political power and importance, nor would it exasperate and stimulate them to insurrection by plausible commiseration of their wrongs; but it held, with a firm and steady hand, the balance impartially between Capital and Labour, and it reconciled and harmonized both. On the one side, it preached to the slave the duty of loyal obedience, and comforted him with the assurance that faithful service rendered to an earthly master, as to Christ,[6] would receive an eternal reward in heaven, and that so he would be "the Lord's freeman."[7] On the other hand, it boldly told the master that he had "a Master in heaven," with Whom there is no respect of persons, and that he was responsible to that Master for the souls of his slaves, and that his slave was his brother in Christ; and in Christ's name it required him to treat his slave "not now as a slave, but above a slave; a brother beloved in Christ."[8]

And what was the result of such exhortations as these?

[3] Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. viii. 13; Polit. i. 4.

[4] As under Spartacus, B.C. 73.

[5] Eph. vi. 5—9. Col. iii. 22; iv. 1. 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2. Titus ii. 9—12. 1 Pet. ii. 18—20.

[6] Eph. vi. 5—8. Col. iv. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 1. [7] 1 Cor. vii. 22.

[8] Eph. vi. 9. Col. iv. 1, 9. Philemon 16.

The wintry frosts of slavery were gradually thawed and melted away under the genial influence of the warm sunbeams and vernal breezes of the Gospel of Christ, Who, by His Incarnation, has bound all together, whether bond or free, as fellow-members in His own mystical Body; and has made them to be children of one heavenly Father by adoption and grace, and brethren of the same household, and fellow-worshippers in the same churches and at the same altars on earth, fellow-citizens of the same country, and fellow-heirs of the same everlasting kingdom of heaven.

Here is an example and instruction for us. Heaven forbid that we should imagine that the British mechanic or labourer is in the same condition as the Greek or Roman slave. But is it not too true, that, by some capitalists and employers of labour, they are regarded as little better than "living machines"? They are called "hands," as if they had no hearts; and they are treated by some as if they had not immortal souls, redeemed by the Blood of Christ, and as if their masters were not responsible in the sight of God for them, and as if the eternal welfare of their souls was a thing of no concern to those by whom they are employed.

We read in Holy Scripture that the patriarch Abraham had more than three hundred servants,[9] and that he took care that every one of them should be brought into covenant with God,[1] and that God blessed him for his fatherly regard and care of their spiritual welfare.[2] We know that Philemon, the Christian master at Colossæ, had "a church in his own house,"[3] and rejoiced to welcome St. Paul to it, and encouraged the preaching of the Gospel; and that Onesimus and his fellow-servants kneeled there in prayer with their master, as beloved brethren in Christ.

Let the employers of labour in our cities imitate these examples. God be thanked, we can point with joy to many English Philemons, who are wisely mindful of these things, and act in a generous consciousness of their unspeakable importance. Let us hope and pray that the time may come, when every employer of labour will recognize the truth, that

[9] Gen xiv. 14.
[2] Gen. xviii. 19.
[1] Gen. xvii. 23—27.
[3] Philemon 2.

they who enrich him by the toil of their bodies have a claim on him for a supply of spiritual provision for their souls. Let him regard them with affectionate care, as brethren beloved in Christ. Let him build schools and churches for them, and contribute to the maintenance of a Christian Ministry for them. Let him be sure that this will be no unprofitable investment of his capital even in this world. It will unite the hearts of employers and employed in the bonds of Christian brotherhood. It will be a pledge of love and peace. And when all the labours of earth are over, and all its works shall have vanished away,[4]—when the sound of the mills of Nottingham is heard no more, and the din of the foundries of Lincoln is silenced for ever,—it will have its abundant reward, in the blessed Sabbath of eternity.

Such remarks as these may be addressed especially to those who live in our populous towns. But we must not forget that there are others who are large proprietors or occupiers of land in agricultural districts.

Some among us are Patrons of ecclesiastical benefices. Let me earnestly entreat them as they love the Lord who bought them, and as they fear Him as their future Judge, to regard the exercise of Church Patronage as a solemn trust to be exercised as in His sight, for His honour, and for the good of the souls which He has purchased with His own Blood. He will require a strict account hereafter how it has been exercised, and He will bless and reward all who exercise it aright.

Patrons of benefices, lay impropriators of tithes, and large proprietors of land, must look for a solemn reckoning hereafter. Would to God that all would duly meditate upon it, especially that they would take pity on God's ministers and their families, who are sometimes left to starve on a slender pittance, while the lords of the soil and the owners of the tithes are living in affluence and luxury.

But to extend our range further. Each of us has a trust. Each of us is God's steward. The souls of our farm labourers, and of our servants, are committed to our care by Him. We owe them the duty of a good example; the duty of

[4] 2 Pet. iii. 10—12.

piety toward God, in hallowing His Day, in attendance at His House, and at His Holy Table, and in honouring and helping His Ministers, especially in all that concerns His service.

"Thy people are as they that strive with the priest," were the prophet's words when he described a desperate state of immorality;[5] and the wise man says, "Fear the Lord with all thy soul, and reverence His priests."[6]

Let us endeavour to maintain a spirit of religion in our parishes by daily family prayer; and by encouraging our dependents to come to Church, and to Confirmation, and to Holy Communion. If our parish church is in an unseemly condition; if the roof is pervious to the rain; the walls green with damp; the windows ill glazed; the body of the church choked up with pews; and if it look like a place where men meet to sit and hear, or even to loll and sleep, rather than to kneel down and pray, let the zeal for God's House consume us, as it is said of David and of Christ;[7] and let us not rest till we have done what we can for it.[8] Let God's House be first cared for, and He will bless us in ours. Let our lay brethren think much of His spiritual household—their poor neighbours. Let them encourage their wives and daughters to take an interest in the Sunday-school and in the day-school—let them be school teachers and district visitors. And let the Clergy be entreated to stir up the members of their own households to such good works as these, and to associate their parishioners and their families as fellow-workers with them. Let us try to give all our people something to do for the Church, and they will take more interest in it. Parochial councils, Church Committees of lay communicants, associated with churchwardens and sidesmen under the guidance of the Clergy, for parochial consultation and action; Bible Classes, Communicant Classes, or Church Guilds, for spiritual edification, ought to be organized where possible. We want more of personal sympathy in the Church of England, more of individual application of the pastoral office, and of its ministrations, to

[5] Hosea iv. 4.
[6] Ecclus. vii. 9.
[7] Ps. lxix. 9. John ii. 17.
[8] Ps. cxxxii. 3 4.

the special needs and affections of our people, if we are to recover those who, alas ! are now estranged from us, and if we are to retain those, who, thanks be to God, are now in communion with us.

Thus we may hope for more of peace and love upon earth, and for eternal union in heaven.[9]

[9] I cannot close these remarks without referring with thankfulness to the Christian efforts of large capitalists and employers of labour in towns of this Diocese—such as the late Mr. Adams, and Mr. George Moore of Nottingham—for the spiritual welfare of the persons in their employ; and to what has been done in the city of Lincoln for Church extension by others in a like spirit. Both Nottingham and Lincoln have been happily distinguished by exemption from strifes between Labour and Capital, and by a spirit of harmony among employers and employed.

More than a million sterling has been expended in Church restoration in the Diocese between 1840 and 1874. The particulars may be seen in my "Diocesan Addresses," 1876, pp. 117—140.

ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

A PAMPHLET entitled "CAPITAL PUNISHMENT; dedicated to the Church," was published at London, in 1867.

I felt it my duty to deal with the question in a Sermon in Westminster Abbey on Nov. 24, 1867; parts of it are reprinted here.

Its Author requested my attention to a passage in that Pamphlet, which refers to Genesis ix. 6, and which animadverts on the sense that is assigned to that Text in our AUTHORIZED VERSION of the Bible, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

The strictures of the Pamphlet on that rendering in our English Bible are as follows (page 56) :—

"'*By man* shall his blood,' &c.—What makes all the more mournful the conduct of such of the more learned of the Clergy as uphold "Capital Punishment" upon the strength of this passage, is, that they must be fully aware, that the words '*by man*,' upon which the gist of their argument wholly depends, are, *if not a downright dishonest*, at least an *unscholarly rendering*, and find no equivalent of any kind in the Septuagint, nor even in the Latin Vulgate (wherein certainly no pains are taken to uphold the Creator's character of 'Love'), nor in Wycliffe's Version of the Bible, nor in other important Versions. But they apparently rely upon the large bulk of their readers being unacquainted with these circumstances, and preach or write from the Text, as if, instead of being looked *upon by Biblical critics* as having been frailly Englished, it was universally acknowledged to be in perfect unity with the original Hebrew."

Such are the allegations of the Pamphlet.

The Writer of the Pamphlet in question appeals to "Biblical Critics;" let us therefore see what they say.

I will not quote any who may be supposed to be biassed in favour of the Church of England, and of our Version.

Let us consider them.

The learned Hebraist, *Dr. Kalisch*, in his Translation of the Book of Genesis (p. 220) renders the Text verbatim as it is rendered in our Authorized Version. And he adds the following note on the Text, in confirmation of it, in his Commentary, p. 221.

"בָּאָדָם [ba—Adam] (ver. 6), which is to be connected with the following part of the verse, is emphatically placed first (Gesen. Gram. § 142. 2: Ewald, Gram. § 565), to enjoin that *murder* is to be *visited* on earth *by man*; and that the punishment is not, as in other cases, to be left to Divine retribution."

Dr. Kalisch's Hebrew brethren, *De Sola* (Minister of the congregation of Spanish and Portuguese Jews), *J. L. Lindenthal* (Reader and Secretary to the New Synagogue), and *Dr. M. J. Raphall* (Lecturer at the Synagogue and Head Master of the Hebrew National School at Birmingham), have put forth a revised Version of the Book of Genesis (Lond. 1844). Their rendering of the Text coincides also *literatim* with the rendering in our Authorized Version.

Let us now see what the most eminent German Critics of the present day say on this point. *Dr. Karl Friedrich Keil*, whose Biblical learning is unquestionable, gives the following interpretation of this Text, and the following note upon it, in his Commentary (Biblischer Commentar, Leipzig, 1861, p. 101). "'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, *by man* shall his blood be shed.' By these words God vests His own punitive power in human hands;" and he then quotes the words of Martin Luther: "Here" (remarks *Luther* on this place) "is the first commandment touching the temporal sword. Temporal Government was established by these words; and God's right, the sword, was put into its hands;" "Hic igitur fons est, ex quo manat totum jus civile, et jus gentium. Nam si Deus concedit *homini* potestatem super vitam et

mortem, profectò etiam concedit potestatem super id quod minus est, ut sunt fortunæ, familia, uxor, liberi, servi, agri. Hæc omnia vult certornm hominum potestati esse obnoxia Deus, ut *reos puniant.*"

Dr. M. Baumgarten, in his excellent Exposition of the Pentateuch (Commentar zum Pentateuch; Kiel, 1843, p. 121), thus speaks in his note on this text (Gen. ix. 6): "Here it is ordered that the Blood of the Murderer shall be shed *by man.* Man is commissioned to execute the divine retribution, and is appointed to be God's Vicegerent upon earth. Jehovah Himself is not visible on earth, but in heaven; therefore He is represented on earth by the deputies of His injured Majesty."

The same rendering is given also by *Dr. Aug. Knobel,* in his commentary on Genesis (Leipz. 1860, p. 98).

I will only add here the words of the learned Nonconformist, *Henry Ainsworth,* whose Version of the Pentateuch is justly esteemed for its literal accuracy. He also renders the words precisely in the same manner as they are rendered by the above-recited Expositors, and as they stand in our Authorized Version, and in the following remarks: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, *by man* shall his blood be shed." And he subjoins the following note (p. 42, Lond. 1627): "His blood shall be shed, that is, by the Magistrate, whose power is here stablished for killing all wilful murderers, as the *Chaldee* expresseth it, saying '*With witnesses,* by sentence of the Judges, shall his blood be shed.'"

So much, then, for Biblical Critics and Translators. Their testimony to the accuracy of our English Authorized Version is as strong as possible.

Now, one word as to Lexicographers.

That the Hebrew words בְּאָדָם in this Text are rightly rendered in our Authorized Version "*by man,*" will appear from the statement of *Gesenius,* in his "Thesaurus," under the preposition ב, where he says (p. 99, ed. Tregelles) that this preposition intimates the *agent* (Latin *per*), e. g. "*by* the hand of Moses," or "*by* God;" or the instrument, or efficient cause, as *by* fire. And *Dr. Julius Fuerst* makes a similar assertion (which might be confirmed by innumerable

examples from the Hebrew Scriptures) in his Lexicon (p. 174, ed. Davidson).

With regard now to *Ancient Versions*. The *Septuagint* (to which the Author of the Pamphlet appeals) has the following words here; ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται; that is, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, shall be shed (or poured out) instead of his blood;" a sentence which no Hebrew and Greek scholar will affirm to be a literal equivalent to the original. This rendering is, like many others of the Septuagint, a paraphrase, and it does in fact amount to the same thing as is expressed in our Version; for if the murderer is to be slain, it is clear that some man must slay him. And what argument can thence be derived by those who would abolish capital punishment for wilful murder, it is not easy to see.

The *Vulgate*, which often follows the Septuagint, renders the words thus:—

"Quicunque effuderit humanum sanguinem, fundetur sanguis illius;" that is, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, his blood shall be shed" (i. e. by man); on which a similar remark may be made.

The *Arabic* and *Syriac* versions are more literal, and confirm the rendering of our own Authorized Version. The authority of the *Chaldee Targum* has been already mentioned as also confirmatory of that translation.

As to *Wycliffe's* Version (to which the Pamphlet also appeals), I have not thought it worth while to inquire what its rendering is, because it is notorious that Wycliffe did not translate from the Hebrew Original.[1] But the renderings in the Versions of *Luther*, the *Geneva Version*, the Versions of *Tremellius* and *Pagnini*, which were made from the Hebrew—all coincide with the rendering in our Authorized Translation.

On the whole, then, it may be confidently affirmed that Biblical Critics, Lexicographers, and Versions, corroborate the rendering of this text, as given in our Authorized Version.

[1] See "Complete History of the English Translations of the Bible," by the Rev. John Lewis, p. 21, ed. Lond. 1739.

Let us now proceed to examine these words, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made He man" (Gen. ix. 6).

That was the declaration of Almighty God to the Patriarch Noah and his sons, when they came forth out of the Ark after the Flood, and when He made a covenant with them, as the sole survivors of the human family, and as the representatives of future generations.

The post-diluvian race, and their immediate successors, had a difficult work to perform. They were not permitted by God to remain together in one body; but they were commanded by Him to separate, and to replenish the earth.[2] This was the trial of their faith. They were few, and must go forth in weak companies into a wide uncolonized world. But God assured them of His protection. He pledged Himself to defend them. He recognized in Man His own divine image. Thus Man was invested with dignity and sanctity; and acts of violence against him were to be punished as outrages against God. And God constituted Man as His own Vicegerent for executing the divinely appointed penalty for such aggressions against the divine Majesty, reflected in man God's image and likeness; and He pronounced this solemn edict against wilful murder: "At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man: whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man."

It has been alleged by some, whose opinions are entitled to respectful attention, that Capital Punishment—that is, punishment by Death—is inconsistent with Justice and Charity, and ought never to be inflicted; and that those continental Nations, which have abolished Capital Punishment, ought to be imitated by us. Life (they say) is the gift of God, and ought not to be taken away by any but by God. And Christ says in the Gospel, "*Resist not evil.*"[3] Much more, therefore, do *not inflict it.* And what, it is asked, can be a greater evil, than that a man, with his sins on his head, and with his hands stained with blood, should be sent out of the world into the presence of his Almighty

[2] Gen ix. 1. [3] Matt. v. 39.

Judge, to receive his everlasting doom? And, it is asked, shall man—weak, sinful man—arrogate to himself the Divine prerogative of cutting short the life of a brother, and place himself on the throne of God, and become the Arbiter of Eternity?

These are, indeed, serious questions, and claim careful consideration. What may we say to them?

Almighty God is our Father: Infinite in Mercy, Infinite in Justice, Infinite in Wisdom: and He has vouchsafed to give a reply to these questions in His Holy Word; and from that Divine oracle there is no Appeal. "He that smiteth a man that he die, shall surely be put to death."[4] And again, "He that killeth any man shall surely be put to death:"[5] and again, "The murderer shall surely be put to death:"[6] and again, "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death, he shall surely be put to death:"[7] and again, "Ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood it defileth the land; and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it."[8]

Such are the judicial declarations of Almighty God Himself in His Holy Word. Their meaning cannot be mistaken; and since He is the Author of Life and Death, since He "is the only Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy,"[9] therefore all human opinions, and all human authority, must bow, in reverent submission, before His divine supremacy.

Nor let it be alleged, that, because these declarations are derived from the Code which God gave by *Moses* to the *Hebrew Nation*, they therefore were addressed to *the Hebrew Nation* alone, and do not concern *us*. They were, it is true, promulgated to the Israelites; but they were not promulgated to them as *Israelites*, but as *men*. They are a part of primeval Jurisprudence, antecedent to all written Law, and are of universal and perpetual application. They are grounded on God's Attributes; and on Man's Nature. They are engraven on Man's heart, and are uttered by his

[4] Exod. xxi. 12, 14. Num. xxxv. 18.
[5] Num. xxxv. 33.
[6] Lev. xxiv. 17.
[7] Num. xxxv. 31.
[9] James iv. 12.

Conscience, which is the Voice of God. How otherwise can we explain the language of the first murderer, Cain, "Every one that findeth me shall *slay me*"?[1] He pronounced the sentence of Death on himself. And although God, for wise reasons, thought fit to interfere to prevent the execution of that sentence in his case, yet that voice of Cain, and that special intervention of God, proved what the judicial sentence of murder was, even from the beginning.[2]

Nor was this all. Immediately after the Flood, that is, nearly *nine hundred years before the Levitical Law*, God thought fit to confirm that aboriginal and unwritten Law, by a solemn edict promulgated by His own Divine Voice: "At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, *by man shall his blood be shed;* for in the image of God made He man."

These words prove, that what God said to the Israelites in this respect, was not said to them *as Israelites*, but *as men*, and is to be extended to all. For what is the ground on which God based the prohibition of murder, and on which He authorized and enjoined the infliction of the punishment of Death for it? It is, *because man is made in the image of God:* and whoever sheds man's blood, violates God's image: and man is armed with authority by God, and is invested with a commission from Him, to visit that violation by death. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by *man shall his blood be shed:* for in *the image* of *God made He man.*"

Again, let it not be said, that this primeval Law, proclaimed even by Cain himself, and promulgated by God to Noah, the father and representative of the new generation of mankind after the Flood, and renewed with the most

[1] Gen. iv. 14.

[2] The consent of Mankind that wilful Murder ought to be punished by Death is expressed by the Greek poet:—

Ἀντὶ μὲν ἐχθρᾶς γλώσσης ἐχθρα
Γλῶσσα τελείσθω—τοὐφειλόμενον
Πράσσουσα Δίκη μέγ' ἀϋτεῖ—
Ἀντὶ δὲ πληγῆς φονίας φονίαν
Πληγὴν τινέτω—Δράσαντι παθεῖν,
Τριγέρων μῦθος τάδε φωνεῖ.

Æschyl. Choëphor. 303.

solemn sanctions at Mount Sinai, has been abrogated by Christianity. No: Christianity has not repealed any original Law. Rather it has given new sanctions to it. Especially has it confirmed this Law, which imposes the punishment of Death for Murder. For, on what is this Law grounded? It is based by God Himself on the fact that *Man was made in the image of God.*

At the Flood, when God uttered those Words, the Image of God in Man had been much marred and blemished. Still it survived there: and it waited for the time when its dim characters would be gilded afresh, and be restored to their original lustre. This, and more than this, was done at the Incarnation of Christ. At the first Creation, Man was made in the image of God; but at the second Creation, or Incarnation of Christ, God Himself took our nature, and became "Immanuel," "God with us," "God manifest in the flesh." The Son of God, Who is "the brightness of His Father's Glory, and the *express Image of His Person*,"[3] became Man; and in Him, as the Apostle speaks, "we have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the *image of Him that created him*;"[4] and Man has become "a member of Christ," "a Temple of the Holy Ghost."[5]

Much more forcibly, therefore, may it be said now, than it could have been said to Noah, "In the image of God made He man," God has made us anew in Christ. He therefore who sheds the blood of man, abuses the strength of that human nature which the Son of God Himself has taken; and he abuses it to violate that nature which the Son of God has joined indissolubly by His Incarnation to the Nature of God.

Let us now consider the allegation, that it is not consistent with Justice and Mercy, that man should take away the life of his brother man, and send him to the tribunal of God; and that therefore the punishment of Death ought not to be inflicted by any human authority.

But what says the God of Mercy and Justice? "Whoso

[3] Heb. i. 3. Cp. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Col. i. 15.
[4] Col. iii. 10.
[5] 1 Cor. iii. 17; vi. 19.

sheddeth man's blood, by *man shall his* blood be shed, for in the *image of God* made He *man.*" It is not left a matter of choice whether man should punish murder by Death. God requires him to do so. But let it not be therefore said, that it is Man, acting merely as Man, influenced by human motives, or as the delegate of any earthly power, who is authorized and commissioned to do so. No; it is not man *as man,* but it is man as *God's image,* acting in His name, and by His authority, and in obedience to His law, who is enabled and commanded to do it. It is God Himself acting by man, as His deputy and minister,—for the maintenance of His honour, and the execution of His commandments—Who does it. Law is God's Voice; and the civil Magistrate is God's Deputy, and Vicegerent, His Minister and Representative. The sword which he bears, is not the sword of man, but of God; and he must "not bear it in vain," but must use it in obedience to Him, and for the execution of His law, for the punishment of the outrage against God's image and Majesty, and for the protection of human Society, which is an institution of God.

This is clear from the Christian Scriptures. "Let every soul" (says St. Paul) "be subject to the higher powers;[6] for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are *ordained of God;* whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the *ordinance of God,* and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good; and thou shalt have the praise of the same. For he is the *minister of God* to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he *beareth not the sword in vain,* for he is the *minister of God,* an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."[7]

Therefore, at the Coronation of the Sovereign Princes of England, the Sword of Justice is taken from the altar, and

[6] Or rather "*authorities,*" *ἐξουσίαις,* and so throughout the passage. It is not *physical power,* but lawfully *constituted authority,* of which the Apostle is speaking.

[7] Rom. xiii. 1—4.

before the delivery of that Sword these words are uttered: "Hear our prayers, O Lord, we beseech Thee; and so direct and support Thy servant our Sovereign, that the Sovereign may not *bear the sword in vain*, but *may use it* as the *Minister of God, for the punishment of evil doers*, and for the protection and encouragement of those that do well, through Jesus Christ our Lord." [8] And at the delivery of that sword, similar words are used: "Receive this Kingly sword, brought now from the Altar of God. With this sword of Justice stop the growth of iniquity, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good order; that, doing these things, you may be glorious in all virtue; and so faithfully serve our Lord Jesus Christ in this life, that you may reign for ever with Him in the world to come."

This grave question has been argued also on the ground of human sympathies. Be it so. We, who contend for the supremacy of divine Law, can never concede that we are doing any violence to human affections. God is the Author of human nature. And our affections are a very large and important part of that nature; and, as all God's works are in perfect harmony with one another, we may be sure that the right exercise of our affections will be found to be in complete consistency with His Law, and also with the best interests of human Society, which is God's work.

We are called upon by some to sympathize with murderers; and, therefore, to abolish the punishment of death for murder. We do sympathize with murderers. We sympathize with all—especially with those in sin and sorrow. But how are we to show our sympathy? Are we to proceed on the supposition that God is not merciful, and does not feel sympathy with human weakness and affliction? Nay, He is our loving and tender Father, and He proved His love for us by giving His Son to die for us. And this compassionate God has said, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

[8] See the "Form and Order of the Coronation in Westminster Abbey," p. 33. London, 1838.

And, let us be sure, that even in this command, stern as it may seem, there is Mercy. Consider, how many murders have been *prevented* by it. How much bloodshed has it checked. How many persons have been *deterred* by it from *becoming murderers.* How much the peace and safety of families is protected by it. How much is the very existence of Monarchies and States, and of human Society, defended and secured by it.

Let us show our sympathy with the murderer by all means in our power. And, therefore, let us not buoy him up with illusory hopes for this world, and thus do him irreparable and everlasting wrong, by drawing off his mind from penitential preparation for Death, Judgment, and Eternity.[9] But let us pray for him and with him. Let us provide him with a wise and holy spiritual guide, to convince him of sin, to bring him to repentance and thus to console him. Let us assure him that the punishment of *Death itself* is *not a great evil,* but that the punishment which God inflicts *after death* on the impenitent is *the evil to be dreaded;* and that, *if he is truly penitent* for his sins, then he may escape *that* punishment, by faith in *that* blood which has been shed for him—even "the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, which *cleanseth from all sin;*"[1] and that this blood is of such heavenly power and divine virtue, as to wash away the stains of blood from his hands, and from his heart. Let us thus show our sympathy with the murderer, and then he will be blessed hereafter with the penitent malefactor, whom Christ saved on the cross. He will thankfully go to death, yes, he will joyfully welcome it, as some reparation for the wrong done by him to his victim and to society, and as an act of submission to God's law, and he will bless us for evermore.

And here let us consider what is proposed by some to be substituted in the place of Capital punishment for Murder;

[9] The Theodosian Code strictly forbad this; Cod. Theodos. ix. 40, L. 15: "Reos, tempore provocationis emenso, nullus aut teneat aut defendat;" and the Bishops were enjoined to take care that this should not be done.

[1] 1 John i. 7.

Solitary confinement. Now keeping steadily before our eyes the truth, that it is *not death*, but the things *after death*, that are to be feared; and that the thing to be desired is *not* life on earth, but everlasting life in heaven; we affirm that the alternative proposed as a substitute for Capital punishment, namely, solitary confinement, and penal servitude, is infinitely the *more cruel* of the two.

It has not the same good effect of *deterring* men from committing murder: and therefore is not so beneficial to society as Capital punishment. It removes the fear of bodily death (which is a wholesome thing), and it engenders a sullen, moody temper, and not unfrequently produces insanity. It is therefore very unfavourable to the exercise of repentance, and consequently to reconciliation with God, and to the attainment of eternal happiness, through Christ, after death. It is therefore unmerciful [2] to man, as to his best and highest happiness.

Again, men speak of sympathy for murderers. But ought we not to speak also of sympathy for their murdered victims? Men weep for Cain; but have they no tears for Abel his brother, weltering in his blood at his feet? Are we to have no pity for sorrowing relatives—for an aged father, it may be, or a widowed mother, or desolate wife, and orphan children—suddenly bereft of their comfort and support? It is said by some, that it is a cruel thing to send the murderer unprepared into another world, to his last account. But his act was committed *by his own deliberate will;* and the punishment of murder by death *is no new thing;* it is nearly as old as Creation; and he who commits murder *ought* to be *prepared* for death, as the punishment of his crime. And even after he has committed murder, he still lives, and has time for preparation for death. But innocent men, living quietly at home in their houses, ought not to expect to be murdered. And are we not to feel sympathy with them, when sent suddenly into Eternity by the murderer's hand, and into the presence of their Judge without any preparation for it? And have we no

[2] Compare William Wordsworth's Sonnets on the Punishment of Death, Sonnets xi., xii.

sympathy for human Society, whose safeguards will be overthrown?—Are we to have no sympathy with our Police force, the guardians of public peace and order, whose lives will be imperilled, and who will be tempted to abandon their posts, and to leave Society to the mercy of its worst enemies, if, by ill-advised sympathy with criminals, we encourage crime; and if, by zeal for murderers, we give a premium to murder itself? Is it not to be feared, that assassinations are becoming more common among us, because the assassin already speculates on popular sympathy? This has been much more the case in those countries where Capital punishment has been abolished. How many Sovereigns in Europe in the last few years have been in imminent danger of death from the hand of the murderer, supposing himself to be a hero. Let us beware, lest, by removing any of the barriers which the arm of God Himself has raised against murder, we ourselves become accessory to it, and bring His wrath on ourselves, and confusion on our country; for "Blood," He says, "defileth the land."[3] And again, "Blood toucheth blood, therefore shall the land mourn."[4] And again, "The land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence. *Therefore destruction cometh, and they shall seek peace, and there shall be none.* Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumour upon rumour. *The king shall mourn, and the prince shall be clothed with desolation, and the hands of the people shall be troubled.*"[5]

True sympathy is thoughtful and wise. It is not partial; it takes a comprehensive view. It looks around, it looks backward, and it looks forward. It looks beyond the horizon of this world to Eternity. Thus it is most merciful to those who would otherwise become criminals; and it is merciful even to criminals themselves. And this its character is due to its reverence for God's will and work. It knows that men may indeed, if they so will, abolish the penalty of *temporal* Death, but they cannot abrogate God's sentence of *eternal* Death. Men may remove the terrors of the gallows, but they cannot quench the flames of the Lake

[3] Num. xxxv. 33.

[4] Hos. iv. 2, 3.

[5] Ezek. vii. 23—27.

of fire. The penitent malefactor on the scaffold may escape eternal Death, through God's mercy in Christ; but if we abrogate the punishment of temporal Death, and thus diminish the salutary horror for murder, and encourage men to commit it, then we tempt them to incur the penalties of Eternal Death;—penalties a million times more dreadful than that of temporal Death—the penalties of "the worm that dieth not, and of the fire that is not quenched."[6]

Thus, then, we have seen, on the whole, that the infliction of the punishment of Death for wilful murder, is the course most consistent with Wisdom, Justice, and Mercy. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, since it is the course prescribed by God Himself, Who is infinitely wise, just, and merciful?

Finally, there is one way in which we all are bound to labour and pray for the abolition of the punishment of Death. And that is by the *prevention of crime* which incurs it. This can only be effected by means of Christian Education; by setting before the eyes of all, especially the young, the eternal terrors which God Himself denounces against sin, and the infinite joys which He promises to piety and virtue. The maintenance of a belief in the certainty of Future Rewards and Punishments is one of the surest safeguards of the framework of human society. It is the sense of God's Omnipresence and the dread of a Judgment to come which can give ubiquity to Law. It is the Gospel and the Gospel alone—with its sanctions of hopes and fears, and all its means of spiritual grace, which can hallow a State, and consecrate the Throne and shield the Sovereign upon it, and protect us all in our homes. May God of His infinite mercy so order our wills, in obedience to His Law, that this may indeed be so! Then England will enjoy the high honour and privilege of showing to the world by her example that "Righteousness exalteth a nation;"[7] and thus will her "Peace be as a River, and her Righteousness as the waves of the Sea."[8]

[6] Mark ix. 43—48. See Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 15.

[7] Prov. xiv. 34.

[8] Isa. xlix. 23.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND;

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE.

The following sermon was preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, 18th November, 1877.

"And he said, Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand."—Daniel xii. 9, 10.

It is the manner of the Holy Spirit in sacred prophecy to pass rapidly from one future event to another foreshadowed by it, however far off that other event may be. Thus in Psalm lxxii., after describing the peaceful monarchy of Solomon, He proceeds to foretell the glory of the Kingdom of Christ, the Divine Solomon, the Prince of Peace. So our Lord Himself, when sitting on the Mount of Olives, having pre-announced the national judgment hanging over Jerusalem, goes on to predict His own second Advent and the universal Judgment of the world. Similarly the prophet Daniel in the Scripture before us, having in the eleventh chapter revealed the sufferings which the Hebrew Church and nation would endure in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, King of Syria, passes on by a quick transition to unfold the trials which await the Christian Church in the latter days.

Brethren, bear with me for saying that to one whose retrospect in this place reaches back for fifty-seven years, it is a subject for serious inquiry whether in the history of the Church and the World during that time there has not been a gradual tendency towards a fulfilment of this pro-

phecy of Daniel. Looking back on events which have occurred in the last half-century, I would now propose, with God's help, to use them as an occasion for offering to you, my younger brethren, some suggestions as to your own duty consequent upon them.

And first, in reviewing the past, we may recognize a remarkable change in popular opinion concerning the origin and claims of Authority, both civil and ecclesiastical. After the great conflict at the close of the last century there still survived in the public mind some belief that Authority is derived from God, as St. Paul teaches in his thirteenth chapter to the Romans, and St. Peter in the second chapter of his first Epistle; and that obedience is due, for the Lord's sake, to lawful Authority, in things not unlawful, and that resistance to Authority in such things is resistance to God Himself. But this belief has now been greatly weakened, and Authority is commonly supposed to be derived from earth and not from heaven, and from man and not from God, and to have no other claim upon allegiance than that which depends on the voice of the People, and not on the will of God.

This change having taken place, it is not surprising that many ancient Dynasties on the Continent of Europe should have been uprooted, and that there should be little prospect of permanence for those forms of Government which have succeeded them. In one great neighbouring Country, France, there have been more than sixteen different forms of Government in rapid succession in the last eighty years. It would seem as if Daniel's prophecy (ii. 40—43) is now being fulfilled, that the Governments of the latter days which were to grow up after the dissolution of the fourth or Roman Empire would be like *miry clay mingled with iron*, but not cleaving to it. Is there not a marvellous accuracy in this prophetic description? Is it not true that some of these Governments are *like miry clay*, being of the earth, earthy, and brittle as potsherds, by reason of their democratic element? And is it not also true that they are *mingled with iron*, as deriving power not from moral, spiritual, and heavenly influences, but from the earthly

mineral and rigid iron of physical coercion and military force? And is it not true also, that, like mingled iron and clay, they have no principle of cohesion and co-operation?

Together with this change in popular opinion as to the origin and claims of Authority, two other Powers have grown up, and have acquired fresh force in opposition to that authority.

Men crave protection and they admire strength. If they cannot find it in Monarchies, deriving their authority from God, they will constitute supreme powers for themselves. Wherever they see Power endued with vigorous energy, combined with well compacted organization, they gravitate towards it, especially if it acts with devotion and faith, and seems to rely on the support of what is unseen and eternal. On one side, therefore, at this time, some persons almost deify the Roman Papacy. They adore the Roman Pontiff as the Vicegerent of God, as wielding the power of the Most High, as disposing of the things of Time and Eternity, and as having dominion over the human reason, conscience, and will, and as the Infallible Judge in matters both of faith and morals (as was declared in the Vatican Council of 1870), and as having supremacy over all Governments, civil and ecclesiastical.

On the other side, by an excess of reaction, some have been driven to defy all Authority, whether temporal or spiritual, and to cast away all belief in a personal Ruler of the world, and in future Rewards and Punishments, and to place the People on the Throne of God.

These two forces, being antagonistic, are now preparing for a violent conflict. They are hostile to one another; but both of them are opposed to legitimate authority, and will do what they can to subvert it.

Let us now turn to our own Country.

The condition of the Church of England, as a National Establishment of religion, has been greatly modified by events in the last sixty years. The changes in our Constitution have affected the character of the Legislature. The admission into the Legislature of persons who do not accept the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; and

the gravitation of the population to our great towns, where the Church is weak, and where her work is opposed by a flood of cheap Literature hostile to religion and society, have led to the enactment of laws altering the position of the Church. The Union of Scotland, and more recently of Ireland, with England, has naturally exercised a powerful influence on the Imperial Legislature. It may be almost said that the *destinies of the Church of England,* in her relations to the State, depend now *not* so much *on England herself,* as on the opinions and desires of *Scottish Presbyterianism,* and *Irish Ultramontanism,* joined with Sectarianism, Scepticism, and Secularism, leagued against her. This has been exemplified in a remarkable manner by recent debates and decisions in the Imperial Legislature concerning the Burial-grounds of the Church of England. The majority of one hundred and eight *English* votes in defence of our *English* churchyards was reduced to thirty-three by Irish, Scotch, and Welsh votes.

The suppression of Ten Bishoprics in Ireland, the alteration of the tithe system in that country, the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869, are some of the ecclesiastical events there. The ease also with which Church Patronage has been recently abolished in Scotland (A.D. 1874) is significant of the popular feeling there; and the breaking up of the Kirk of Scotland into three separate forms of Presbyterianism, seems to augur ill for the maintenance of any one religious establishment in that country.

In England the greater portion of the revenues of our Cathedral and Collegiate Churches has been alienated by recent legislative enactments, which did not provide for the efficient discharge of capitular duties. Church rates have ceased to be obligatory. The Marriage Law of the Church has been set aside by the Legislature, and great facilities have now been given to Divorce, and even to the marriage of the guilty parties. The Parochial Schools of the Church can claim no subsidy from the State, except by restricting the teaching of religion within narrow limits of time; and the Elementary Schools of the State exclude all distinctive religious formularies from their system of instruction. The

changes made by recent legislation in the religious character of our Colleges and Universities are too well known to you to need any notice from me.

A question, to which I have already referred, and on which the maintenance of the Establishment hangs, is now pending. A few years ago church rates were abolished, on the plea that *our churches and churchyards do not belong to the Nation but to the Church of England;* and that it was unfair that persons dissenting from the Church should be taxed for their support. But now this argument is inverted; and it is alleged that our churches and churchyards *do not belong to the Church of England,* but to the *Nation;* and that, since they are *national* property, persons of any religious persuasion, or of no religious persuasion at all, ought to be permitted freely to officiate at burials in our English churchyards.

It is candidly avowed by many who use this language that the same principle ought to be applied to our *churches;* and if this avowal is made by them *now,* what will be their language if their confidence is increased and their power aggrandized by surrender? We know that in the troubles of the seventeenth century in England our *churches were alienated,* together with our churchyards, and we know how miserable were the results. May we not say that the surrender of our sacred places, which have been solemnly dedicated to God, would be followed by calamities similar to those which befell the Hebrew Church, when, according to Daniel's prophecy, her sanctuary was profaned, in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, and "the abomination and desolation" was set up in the Temple of God?

These and other signs of the times are sufficient to show that the Church of England is beleaguered by a formidable confederacy of powerful adversaries, who are resolved, if they are able, to reduce her to the same condition as that to which the Church of Ireland has been lately reduced. And if it should please God, for our sins, to humble the Church of England in the dust, as she was humbled in the seventeenth century, it is probable that her downfall would be followed by the ruin of other National Institutions (as it then was by

the abolition of the legislative power of the Peerage, and the Monarchy), and by the spread of anarchy and confusion, of fanaticism and impiety; and that England might be reduced to the condition of some other great nations of Europe.

What, then, is our own duty under such circumstances as these? First, to endeavour to revive in the public mind a recognition of the divine origin of Authority, as declared in Holy Scripture. Is it not true that this feeling needs to be awakened in rulers as well as in subjects? If parents, masters, and employers of labour, and if governors, civil and ecclesiastical, were resolved to act in the consciousness that the authority with which they are invested is *received from God;* and that He will call them to a strict account at the Great Day how they have used it; then they would reverence the authority they possess, as a sacred trust from heaven, and would never abuse it to gratify their own selfish desires, or for any other purpose than the glory of God and the welfare of mankind. And if, on the other hand, children, servants, and subjects, and all who are under authority, temporal or spiritual, understood *what* authority *is,* and *whence it comes;* they would not "despise dominion and speak evil of dignities" (Jude 8), but would pray to God for them, and would cheerfully obey authority in all things not unlawful, as doing what they do, "not with eyeservice as menpleasers, but as to the Lord."

If this spirit prevailed, the Church of England would not be weakened, as it is now, by intestine strifes, which are more dangerous to her welfare than her bitterest enemies. We should not see some persons, laying claims to superior sanctity, and yet violating the laws of Christian charity by wilfully giving offence to others, and breaking the bonds of Christian unity, by preaching doctrines and introducing ceremonies alien to the faith and worship of the Church, and driving others to the opposite extreme, and endeavouring to hurry her onward to *disestablishment,* as if it were a harbour of safety, and not a quicksand of shipwreck.

Suffer me to say it, for the sake of our Country, of our Church, and of our God, let us not be impatient. It may

be His will that disestablishment may come; but let us do nothing to hasten it. It may be, that the *temporal* authority may attempt to impose conditions upon the Church, which (if she is loyal to her Divine Lord) she cannot accept; and then her answer must be with the Apostles, "We ought to obey God rather than men." The three children at Babylon were loyal subjects, but they were content to be cast into the fiery furnace rather than commit idolatry at the king's command. Daniel was a loyal subject, but he would not obey the king's decree and omit even once his daily prayers. We must indeed submit to man for the sake of God, but we must never disobey God for the sake of man. We must endeavour to maintain the Establishment for the sake of the State, but we must not sacrifice the Church for the sake of the Establishment. But while we thus act, let us not rush into temptation, and lead others with us. The Established Church of England is one of our greatest national blessings. The Church of England, of all Churches in Christendom, is one of the best teachers of loyalty, and one of the most faithful guardians of Order, Liberty, and Law. For evidence of this, examine her Liturgy, as compared with that of any other Church. Her rule of faith is the written Word of God, not warped by private opinions, but expounded and interpreted by the judgment and practice of the Ancient Church Universal. She holds the faith, neither more nor less, "once for all delivered to the Saints," and declared in the ancient Creeds of the Catholic Church; she dispenses spiritual grace freely and fully in the holy Sacraments instituted by Christ, and she derives the commission of her Apostolic Ministry from the hands of her Divine Lord, enthroned in heaven, and communicating that grace by the unbroken chain of succession of that Apostolic Ministry for eighteen centuries.

To disestablish such a Church as this, would be to inflict the heaviest blow that could fall on the English Nation. Bear with me for speaking feelingly on this subject. As having been entrusted, most unworthily, with the oversight of a large diocese, mainly an agricultural one, I know what Disestablishment would be. Whatever ts ultimate results

might be (under the controlling and over-ruling providence of God) its proximate effect would be to pauperize the priesthood, and to paganize the people. Methodism, the most respectable and vigorous form of Dissent, has worked actively in that diocese, and is powerful in its towns, but it has no resident ministry in its rural districts, which would lapse into a miserable condition, socially, morally, and religiously, if they were deprived of the personal presence and salutary influence of the parochial clergy and of their families.

It is probable that the battle of the English Constitution will have to be fought in agricultural dioceses, where the spirit of loyalty is still strong. If that spirit were weakened there (which it would be, if the Church were disestablished and disendowed) then there is reason to fear that the Constitution would eventually be at the mercy of Secularism, Scepticism, Sectarianism, Republicanism, and Romanism, and that its days would ere long be numbered.

God only knows whether that time may come. Let us do what we can by His help to avert it. We need much prayer, courage, patience, and charity. Let us not close our eyes to the dangers we are in. Let us not be like those prophets who daubed with untempered mortar, and said, "Peace, peace, where there was no peace;" but let us "speak the truth in love." In the days of the persecution of the Hebrew Church, as foretold by Daniel, the enemy began his attack upon it by flattering the priests, and by their means he invaded the sanctuary and destroyed it. As I have already said, a similar attack is now being made against ourselves. Our adversaries are claiming our churchyards and our churches as national property, and unhappily we are not united among ourselves in resisting the assault upon them. On one side nearly 14,000[1] of the clergy have now joined together in a manifesto against the invasion of our churchyards, and in declaring that, while they respect the conscientious scruples of others and are ready to co-operate in any reasonable measures for the removal of real grievances, they are of opinion that the compulsory introduction of other

[1] The signatures amounted in Feb. 1878, to more than 15,000.

services than those of the Church of England into her burial-grounds would be an infringement of her rights, an encroachment on her property, an infliction of a grievance on the consciences of her ministers and members, and a precedent fraught with dangerous consequences to the Church and Nation, and a contravention of those religious purposes for which her churchyards have been set apart by a solemn act of Consecration.

To this we may add that at the various Diocesan Conferences lately held, wherever this question has been discussed, these principles have been affirmed by the faithful Laity of the Church with no less energy than by the Clergy, and the opinion of the recent Church Congress at Croydon to the same effect could not be misunderstood.

It was an axiom of the ancient Church, that nothing should be done by the Clergy and Laity without the Episcopate; but it was also an axiom that nothing should be done by the Episcopate *without* the Clergy and faithful Laity of the Church, and still more that nothing should be done *against* them. May it not, therefore, be hoped that now, after these clear and decisive utterances of the Clergy and Laity of the Church, the whole English Episcopate may henceforth be united with them in this great question? This, indeed, would be an unspeakable blessing; then we might look forward to the future with hope; and then, whatever the secular power may think fit to do to the Church of England as an Establishment, she would be strong in the unity and mutual confidence of her members, and in the protection and blessing of her Divine Lord.

But to take a wider view. It is not improbable, that, in these latter days, to punish Nations for their sins, and to show the divine power of Christianity, Almighty God may be pleased to permit His Church to be left alone, not only independent of temporal powers, but with the temporal powers arrayed against her; and it is probable that the last age of the Church may be like the first age of the Church when she was openly assailed by the World. Certain it is, as Daniel has foretold, that in the latter days there will be "a

time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation." Certain it is, as St. John in the Apocalypse warns us, that Satan's wrath will be most fierce in proportion as his time is short, and as the day of his doom draws near, and that Anti-Christ will rage most fiercely on the eve of the Coming of Christ. But even if this should be the case let us not be dismayed. When Laws and Institutions fail, then the courage of the faithful becomes more conspicuous. The dissolutions of National Establishments of religion are public calamities, but they are tests of personal devotion, faith, and zeal, and may conduce to the growth and exercise of personal holiness. The fall of Institutions is a signal for the rising up of Individuals. When the Church of Israel was disestablished, and false worship was set up in its place, then the greatest of the prophets, Elijah, came forth and stood upon Carmel, a witness for God against idolatrous prophets, priests, princes, and people. You remember the parable of the two baskets of figs, the one of bad and the other of good, in Jeremiah. The one, the bad, represented the members of the Church of Jerusalem who vainly gloried in themselves and said, "The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord are these." The other basket of good figs symbolized the Jewish exiles who had been chastened and purified by their captivity at Babylon. Ezekiel, not at Jerusalem, but an exile on the banks of the river Chebar, saw the glory of the Lord. Daniel, not in the temple, but an exile in Chaldea, had a revelation of Christ. St. John, an exile in the Isle of Patmos, beheld the Apocalypse. If Antiochus Epiphanes had not raged against the Hebrew Church, where would have been the glory of the faithful priests Eleazar and Mattathias, and of the mother and her seven martyred children, and of Judas Maccabæus and his brethren?

May we not say that we ourselves have already been awakened to a clearer sense of our own solemn responsibilities and spiritual privileges by chastisements we have lately suffered? At the beginning of this century, and for some years after it, many were slumbering in a torpid bedridden orthodoxy. The services of our Cathedrals were

heartless, cold, and dreary. Canonries of cathedrals were regarded as sinecures. In the Collegiate Church of Westminster, with which I was connected for twenty-five years, only one month's residence in the year had for more than a century been regarded as sufficient for the discharge of canonical duties. In the Collegiate Church of Southwell, in the diocese of Lincoln, only three months' residence in four years was all that was considered requisite for its canons. In the college chapels of our Universities daily attendance was required of our undergraduates, but many of the persons who derived their endowments from the bounty of the founders were rarely seen worshipping there. In our parishes not much was done for our sacred fabrics by voluntary efforts.

But it has pleased God to arouse us, and new life has shown itself in later years. Our "vales of Achor" have become to us "doors of hope." The change for the better in our Cathedrals is visible to all. With regard to religious life in our colleges you are better able to speak. This, however, my younger brethren, permit me to say, that in proportion as the rigour of academical laws has been relaxed, and your own private liberty has been enlarged with regard to public religious observances, your own personal responsibilities in these respects have been greatly increased. In a spirit of generous confidence you are thrown back on yourselves, and on your own consciences. Let me entreat you to be a law unto yourselves. Emulate the spirit of the golden age, as described by the Roman poet:—

> Saturni gentem, haud vinclo nec legibus æquam,
> Sponte suâ veterisque Dei se more tenentem. (Virg. Æn. vii. 203.)

And here we may thank God for having raised up examples in our two ancient Universities of personal zeal and devotion, and moral and religious courage and self-sacrifice, and self-dedication to Missionary work at home and abroad; and we may thank God also that this spirit is now animating many of our daughters and sisters in Christ, who, in love of Him and the souls for which He shed His blood, are giving themselves up with holy self-consecration to the work of edu-

cating the poor in schools, and to the nursing of the sick in infirmaries and hospitals, and to missionary labour at home and in foreign lands, especially in India and Africa. And with regard to our parish churches, we have to record with thankfulness to God that about twenty-eight millions sterling have been expended in the last forty years in their restoration and enlargement, and in the building of new ones.

In other respects, also, our trials have been overruled by Almighty God stirring our hearts for good. The judicial decision of the Final Court of Appeal on the doctrine of Holy Baptism has led to a more careful examination of the teaching of Holy Scripture, and of the Christian Fathers, and of our own English Reformers, and of our Prayer Book, and to a clearer enunciation of the truth concerning that Sacrament. Recent legislative action of Parliament on Ecclesiastical questions has led to a deeper consciousness of the need of a revival of the Diocesan and Provincial Synods of the Church; and if it should please God to visit us for our sins, and that the Church of England should cease to be a national institution, we may be thankful that our recent training in provincial Convocations and in diocesan Synods and Conferences has made us better prepared for such a catastrophe, than we should have been fifty years ago.

Again, the quickening of parochial and diocesan life amongst us has produced a sense of the necessity of an increase of the Episcopate, which (let us say it with gratitude) Parliament itself has lately recognized, and will soon, we trust, more fully recognize. A growing faith in the Divine constitution of the Christian Church, as it existed from the time of the Apostles for fifteen centuries, and in the blessings vouchsafed by Almighty God to the faithful, by means of the Word and Sacraments, dispensed by the threefold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, has led to the foundation of many new Episcopal Sees in our foreign dependencies. Our colonial and missionary Dioceses now amount to sixty-two, and to these we may add the fifty-seven sees of the United States of America, which are the offspring of the British Church; so that we can now count one hundred and nineteen dioceses which have sprung into

life since the year 1784. "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

On the whole, then, brethren, while there is much to warn, there is also much to cheer us. It seems that each of the two antagonistic forces of good and evil is now developing itself with greater energy; the good becoming better, and the bad becoming worse. The spirit of Prophecy reveals clearly that the last days will be days of conflict between them. It seems to foretell that the Church of Christ will be deprived of temporal supports. The persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes will reproduce itself with greater intensity in Christendom. The book of Revelation prepares us for this trial. In the sixth chapter, at the eve of the end of the world, it speaks of a great earthquake. In the sixteenth chapter it describes that convulsion by a symbolical name, "Armageddon" (the mount of cutting to pieces); in the twentieth chapter it calls it by another symbolical name, derived from Ezekiel, the rising up of the vast and diverse forces of Gog and Magog against "the beloved City and Camp of the Saints." Whatever may be the precise meaning of those words, they certainly betoken struggles and confusions and assaults upon the Church of God. Our Lord compares the latter days to those before the Flood, and to those before the destruction of Sodom, and to those before the fall of Jerusalem. Such revelations as these may well excite our vigilance. They are words of warning to the Church and Realm of England. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

My younger brethren, you will not suppose that by such words as these I am intending to disturb the peaceful tenor of your appointed studies in this place. No, on the contrary, let me rather say that the diligent pursuit of those studies is your best preparation for the trials and troubles of public life. There can be no better preservative against "the oppositions of science, falsely so called," which are now leading many astray, than the habit of exact reasoning, which is generated by the discipline of Mathematical Science, especially when hallowed by that reverential spirit of true Philosophy, which animated the mind of a Bacon, a Newton,

and a Barrow, and in our own days of a Whewell, a Sedgwick, and a Herschel, whose names are household words in this University. And let me say of those Classical Studies which also claim your attention here, as among the best instruments of mental discipline; and in which the human intellect freely ranges over the wide domain of the History, Philosophy, and Poetry of the greatest nations of the ancient world, that you will find in your future career that the continued cultivation of Classical Literature (and I trust you will never cease to cultivate it) will elevate and enlarge your views, and raise your minds beyond the narrow limits and above the low level of ephemeral things; and will impart to them a sweet solace in the cares and sorrows of public and private life; and will soothe you with harmonious melodies, and enrich you with noble recollections, and adorn your minds with glorious imagery, and prepare you for the study of the highest and holiest of all sciences, that of Theology—"the Sabbath and haven of all human contemplations" (as Lord Bacon calls it), and for daily devout meditation on God's Holy Word, which will give you true wisdom, and without which the theories of politics are but illusory dreams, and the history of nations a dark and unintelligible mystery.

Dear friends and brethren, the destinies of your Church and Country depend mainly under God on the character and conduct of the rising generation of England. They are in your hands. The shadows of the latter days are falling upon us. You will endeavour to avert the calamities which seem to be hanging over us; but you will not be dismayed by them. You will regard them as calls from God to arouse you to noble deeds and heroic sufferings for the truth. We have reason to hope and believe that bright examples of Christian valour, not inferior to those of primitive Confessors and Martyrs, and made more bright by the darkness of the contrast, will shine gloriously in the gloom of the latter days. England may hope to see Christian Elijahs, Christian Jeremiahs, and Christian Ezekiels. We do not expect new revelations. But is the Lord's arm shortened? Why should not the Church of the latter days see even the

apostolic courage, zeal, and calmness of a Paul, a Peter, and a John, of an Ignatius, a Polycarp, and a Cyprian? "Many," says Daniel,[1] "shall be purified and made white and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand." "They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."[2] Earthly dynasties will pass away; but the dissolution of earthly things will wean your minds from this world, and make you look upward to heaven and onward to Eternity. Earthly dynasties will pass away, but the throne of Christ endureth for ever. His kingdom will never be destroyed. Empires have been overthrown, national Churches may be disestablished, but the Holy Scriptures, the Christian Sacraments, the Catholic Creeds, the threefold Ministry, these will never be disestablished. "The waves of the sea may rise mightily, and rage horribly, but the Lord Who dwelleth on high is mightier.[3] The Lord sitteth above the waterflood, the Lord abideth a king for ever.[4] Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." He has promised to be with us alway, even unto the end of the world, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against His Church. The Holy Ghost, once given at Pentecost, will abide for ever with the Church. "He that endureth to the end shall be saved."[5] Therefore the word of our blessed Lord to each one of yourselves is this: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."[6]

[1] Dan. xii. 10.
[2] Dan. xii. 3
[3] Ps. xciii. 5.
[4] Ps. xxix. 9.
[5] Matt. x. 22.
[6] Rev. ii. 10.

CONTINUITY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; ST. HUGH OF LINCOLN.

In a former part of this work[1] it has been mentioned that the Author, having resided as Canon of Westminster for nearly twenty-five years, in the house adjoining the Chapel in which St. Hugh was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln on September 21, A.D. 1186, accepted, after some hesitation, the offer of the Bishopric of Lincoln on November 17th, 1868, being the anniversary of St. Hugh's death, and marked as St. Hugh's Day in the Calendar of the English Church.

Nearly ten years afterwards he was invited to reopen a church—that of Clee in North Lincolnshire—which had been consecrated by St. Hugh, as Bishop of the Diocese, in the year 1192; the record of which is still preserved in a contemporary inscription on one of the columns of the church. These incidents suggested some reflections on the Continuity of the English Church; and the feelings thus produced were expressed by me in the following address at the reopening of Clee Church, after restoration, on July 20, 1878.

"Isaac digged again the wells of water, which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham; and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them" (Gen. xxvi. 18).

It has been well said by a wise man of old (St. Augustine) that the life of each of the Patriarchs was a *prophecy*. It is not only a *history*, but it foreshadowed things to come, even to the end of time. This is specially true with regard to the life of Isaac. In all things Isaac conformed to his father's, Abraham's, will, and reflected his father's acts. In the

[1] Vol. i. 310, 311.

journey to the mysterious Sacrifice of Moriah—figurative of Christ's Death and Resurrection—the sacred historian says twice, in memorable and far-reaching words, "*they went both of them together*" (Gen. xxii. 6, 8), prefiguring thereby the perfect unanimity of the Father and the Son in the great Sacrifice of the Cross for the salvation of the world. Abraham (we read) went to Gerar, and found an Abimelech and a Phichol there. We read also that Isaac went to Gerar, and found an Abimelech and a Phichol there. Again, Abraham made a covenant with an oath concerning a well, and called the place Beer-sheba (that is, the *well* of the *oath*); and we read also that Isaac renewed the covenant with an oath concerning a well, and renewed also the name Beer-sheba. And in the Scripture now before us it is said that "Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father (for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham), and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them."

In all these things (as ancient Expositors of the Book of Genesis have observed) we have not only real historical facts, but also deep spiritual mysteries. In this filial conformity of Isaac's will to his father Abraham's will, in the reflexion of Abraham's life in his son Isaac's life, we may discern beautiful gleams of that relation of perfect love in which the Everlasting Son of God, Who became Incarnate for our sakes, conformed to His Father's will, and reflected His mind. It is written that He is the brightness of His Father's glory and the express image of His person (Heb. i. 3). He said, My meat and drink it is to do My Father's will, and to finish His work. I came into the world to do His Will (John iv. 34; v. 30; vi. 38). The Father dwelleth in Me (John xiv. 10). The Son can do nothing of Himself but what He seeth the Father do; whatsoever things He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth Him all things that Himself doeth (John v. 19, 20).

And now to descend to particulars, especially as to this Scriptural history of Wells.

In Paradise itself God the Father (with reverence be it

said) made a Beer-sheba, a Well of an Oath; He opened there a fountain of eternal life to Man, on condition of his obedience. Again, at Sinai God made a Beer-sheba; He opened another well-spring and made another covenant with His people, on a similar condition. But these Wells were stopped by the Enemy. And what was the work of the Blessed Son of God in the Gospel? It was to reopen these Beer-shebas; it was to restore these Wells of life, and to make them spring forth again with a new effusion of running waters, even with the living waters of the Holy Spirit, and with the never-failing streams of the ever-blessed Gospel, in order to cleanse and refresh the weary and thirsty pilgrim travelling through the wilderness of this world to the Canaan of his heavenly home; and to irrigate and fertilize the world; so that now, in the Church of God, "the Spirit and the Bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. xxii. 17).

Let us illustrate this statement by reference to human society. At the beginning of the Book of Genesis, we read that God instituted Marriage in Paradise, in the time of Man's innocency, and made it to be a fountain and well-spring of all household charities, and of all domestic happiness. Here was a Beersheba. But in process of time this holy Well of a sacred covenant was stopped up. The Law of Marriage, given by God the Father at the beginning, was corrupted by the sins of men; by Polygamy, by facilities of Divorce, by breaches of the Marriage Vow. Such was the condition of society in our Lord's age, in Judea itself. But the Son of God restored that primeval Beersheba. By the Incarnation He hallowed our human Nature, and dignified Womanhood; He espoused to Himself a Church, and consecrated Marriage, and beautified it by His first miracle at Cana, and reopened that sacred well-spring of love and peace and joy, by reinstating Marriage in its primeval, paradisaical beauty, and more than Patriarchal purity, and by protesting against Polygamy, and by denouncing Divorce, and by anathematizing Adultery, in those divine words from those pure and holy lips, recalling men's

memory to the day of Woman's creation from Man. "In the beginning God created them male and female, and for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and be joined to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 5, 6. Mark x. 8, 10).

Would to God, my dear friends, that the present generation in England would listen to these divine words. We must speak plainly. In this nineteenth century, which vaunts its superior intelligence, the sanctity of Marriage is in danger. Domestic purity is in jeopardy, and household happiness in peril of being ruined by facilities for Divorce, and by sins of conjugal infidelity; and wherever this is so, we must bid farewell to the love of parents and children, and to all those graces which impart a holy beauty and joy to the Christian family, and which shed a heavenly charm and loveliness on the lives of children, and take away all bitterness from their deaths, and make the grave of children to be like a beautiful garden, blossoming with flowers of faith and hope, full of immortality. Would to God that a voice of power were now lifted up among us from the pulpits of our Metropolitan Cathedrals and Churches, and in our great Towns, to warn us that God's Judgments are hanging over us, and that, except we repent, we must look for an outpouring of the vials of His wrath upon us, because, although God formed this Beersheba of Holy Matrimony in Paradise, and Christ the Son of God re-opened it in the Gospel, we act the part of Philistines, and stop up this sacred Well, and thus bring on ourselves woes such as fell on Jerusalem herself, which rejected the Son of God.

But let us pass on to apply this Scripture to the holy and happy work of to-day, the work of Church Restoration.

All true Church Restoration (as its name implies) is a work of renewal. Let us look at such a work, in the first place spiritually. The Church of Christ is a Beersheba; a pure fountain and well-spring of living waters flowing from God's love in Christ. Such was the primitive Church of Christ, a Beersheba, a "Well of an oath," of a covenant between

God and Man; a Beersheba, flowing with the living waters of the Spirit in Holy Scripture; a Beersheba in the Blessed Sacrament of Holy Baptism and in the Communion of Christ's Blessed Body and Blood, deriving all their virtue from His opened and bleeding side on the Cross; a Beersheba in the Christian Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which Orders are divinely appointed channels of spiritual grace to men; a Beersheba in public prayer, and praise, and thanksgiving, by which perennial blessings flow to devout Christian souls.

Such was the Church in primitive times. Such it was in our own land at the beginning. But look at the Scripture before us. The wells which Isaac's herdmen dug at Gerar were made occasions of strife by other herdsmen, and thence one of them was called *Ezek* or *contention*, and another was called *Sitnah* or *hatred* (Gen. xxvi. 20, 21). In like manner there have been spiritual *Ezeks* and spiritual *Sitnahs* in our own land; specially was this the case in the times before and at the English Reformation in the sixteenth century. But our English Reformers, thank God, like Isaac's herdmen who digged again the wells which were digged in the days of Abraham his father, did a work of *restoration*. They made no new Gospel, they made no new Sacraments, no new Creed, no new Order of Christian Ministers. No. They *reopened* and *restored* the old primitive *Beersheba*s, and called *them by their old names*. And as we read in Genesis that after the *Ezeks* and *Sitnahs* of contention and hatred, Isaac's herdmen had a well of *Rehoboth* or of *enlargements* (Gen. xxvi. 22), so after the Ezeks and Sitnahs of the Reformation the Church of England has her Rehoboths, as may be seen in the wide extension of the Anglican Communion in which about one hundred and twenty new Dioceses have been formed in our colonies and dependencies, and in America, in less than one hundred years before this time; and as may be seen, as it were in a picture, in the present month,[2] in the gathering of a hundred Bishops at the Lambeth Conference from all parts of the world, and from

[2] The Lambeth Conference in July, 1878; at which 100 Bishops were present.

Dioceses which have been formed by missionary enlargements of the English Church.

And now a word of application to this present Church. From the Latin inscription on the slab in one of the Norman piers near the south porch, we learn that this Church was consecrated nearly 700 years ago, "in the year of our Lord 1192, by Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, in the time of King Richard," namely, Richard the First, commonly called *Cœur de Lion*. That inscription dates from that year. I will not say that the age in which this Church was founded and consecrated by that holy and courageous Bishop, was free from corruption. No: it was not; but this I do not hesitate to affirm, that no man had a more sincere and devout[3] love and zeal for the Beersheba of Holy Scripture, no one in that age studied it more diligently, no one knew it more thoroughly, or loved it more dearly, than that apostolic Bishop of Lincoln, St. Hugh.

His intrepid conduct, tempered with Christian Charity, derived from that holy fountain, in relation to King Richard himself, deserves grateful commemoration. The king demanded English soldiers to be sent to him in France for his foreign wars; and in a Council at Oxford, presided over by Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, each of the Bishops of England was required to furnish 300 men for that foreign service. Some of them complied with the request; but Hugh rose up in Council and said that at his consecration in the Cathedral Church at Lincoln, he had taken an oath to be faithful to it, and to maintain its franchises; one of which was that it was bound to supply 300 men to the king for military service in *England*, but *not in foreign parts*. He went over to France to justify his conduct to King Richard, who was greatly exasperated against him, and by his firm and loving behaviour, he prevailed

[3] The particulars here specified concerning St. Hugh are derived from the history of his life, by his Chaplain, entitled "Magna Vita S. Hugonis Episcopi Lincolniensis," edited by Rev. J. F. Dimock, Canon of Lincoln, Lond. 1864. A life of St. Hugh has just been written by the Rev. G. G. Perry, Canon of Lincoln and Proctor for the Diocese.

on that monarch, whom he found in a Church, to embrace him.

But he did more than this. "Thou, O King," he said, taking him by the hand and leading him to a place near the altar, "art my parishioner; and I shall have to give an account to God hereafter of the spiritual state of thy soul, at the dreadful day of doom. I hear it said of thee, O King, that thou are not faithful to thy marriage vow; and that thou for the sake of money conferrest Ecclesiastical Benefices in thy royal patronage on some clergymen who are not worthy of them. I therefore solemnly exhort thee to repent and amend thy life." Having thus admonished him, he gave the king his blessing.

After this interview with the Bishop in that church (it was at Château Gallard) that noble-hearted monarch Richard said to his courtiers, "In good troth, sirs, if all the Bishops of my realm were like Hugh, no king or noble would rise up against them." And he asked for the Bishop's prayers. We may therefore feel sure that St. Hugh desired that this Church of Clee should be a Beersheba, a well-spring of evangelic truth.

It is recorded in the interesting biography of him by his friend and chaplain, that he required the Holy Scriptures to be read regularly at his ordinary meals, and that Holy Scripture was his daily bread, and though he was obliged to be travelling continually from place to place over his vast Diocese, yet in his journeys he never intermitted his daily readings of Scripture.

Here, brethren, is a lesson for us.

From the solemn day of the Consecration of this Church, to this joyful day of its Restoration, nearly 700 years have passed away, and in that time there have been fifty-four Bishops of Lincoln in continuous succession. Here then in this Church we see a happy practical evidence of the Continuity of the Church of England. Here we may find comfort for ourselves in these restless times. How many changes have taken place in England since this Church of Clee was consecrated by St. Hugh. How many royal dynasties have been overthrown. The Norman dynasty has

vanished: the Plantagenets have disappeared. The Houses of York and Lancaster have passed away. The Stuarts are no more. But the Church of Christ remains unchanged. Christ's Kingdom can never be destroyed. It remains established for Eternity. And, brethren, that Kingdom may be ours. Here in this Church we ourselves have the same spiritual Beersheba as our forefathers had. To-day we have just been joining together in the profession of our Christian Faith in the same Creed—the Nicene Creed—as sounded in this Church in the days of St. Hugh, nearly seven centuries ago, and as sounded throughout Christendom fifteen hundred years ago. Our Spiritual Beershebas in lapse of ages were marred and choked up. But they are now cleared, opened, and beautified, and sparkle with fresh, pure, living water, and charm the eye and rejoice the heart, like the lovely form of that sweet child whose memory this church recalls, preserves, and embalms.[4]

Let us thank God for these things, and let us be sure that if we drink the living waters with thirsty hearts which gush forth from these our spiritual Beershebas, if we love the refreshing streams of Holy Scripture read there, and Holy Sacraments administered there, and of holy prayers and holy praise, which flow forth from these fountains and well-springs of the Spirit, given us by our heavenly Father's love; and if we do not allow our Beershebas to be stopped by enemies, nor to be tainted with the infusions of false doctrine, or schismatical bitterness, or noxious superstitions, then though our pilgrimage here below may be in a path through a vale of tears, yet "we shall go from strength to strength, and our pools will be filled with water;" and hereafter parents will be restored to children, and children be restored to parents for ever and ever, and God will wipe all tears from all faces, and there will be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, for all these things will have passed away (Rev. xxi. 4).

[4] Anna Muriel Thorold, buried in Clee Churchyard, August 24, 1876, aged one year and rather more; daughter of A. W. Thorold Grant Thorold, of Weelsby House, Esq., the generous restorer of Clee Church, to the glory of God, and in memory of his dear child.

WELCOME FROM THE ENGLISH TO THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

The following record of loving spiritual intercourse between the Churches of England and America was printed at Lincoln at the time of the Lambeth Conference in July, 1878, and on the occasion of a visit to Lincoln by the Right Rev. A. Cleveland Coxe, D.D., Bishop of Western New York, who preached the Annual Sermon for S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. in Lincoln Cathedral, on Wednesday, July 17, 1878. Bishop Coxe was accompanied by the Bishop of Albany, the Right Rev. W. C. Doane, D.D., and by the Bishop of Iowa, the Right Rev. W. S. Perry, D.D. The Bishop of Nova Scotia, the Right Rev. H. Binney, D.D., representing the oldest Colonial See; and the Bishop of Ontario, the Right Rev. J. T. Lewis, D.D., were also present in the City and Cathedral of Lincoln at the same time.

The Christian Faith and Love of the Churches of England and America, and their union in the sacred bonds of Christian Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship were symbolized by a beautiful offering of an Eucharistic Alms-bason from the Church of America to the Church of England in 1872 by the hands of the late noble-hearted Bishop of Lichfield, George Augustus Selwyn, D.D.

The design, engraven on that offering, has been described in an American document as follows:—

"In the centre of the Alms-bason is the hemisphere, showing the Atlantic Ocean, with the Old World on the East of it and the New World on the West. A scroll on the ocean bears the inscription, which expresses

the spirit of the gift: "*Orbis veteri novus, occidens orienti, Filia Matri.*"

In the upper part of the hemisphere is a circular chased medallion, which bears a ship, typical of the Church, having the Cross at its prow, the Labarum on its sail, the Pastoral Staff of the Apostolic Episcopate as its mainmast, upheld by two ropes on either side for the other two orders of Priests and Deacons; and the initials "S. S.," signifying the Sacred Scriptures, on the rudder.

The ship is leaving England, and directs its course towards the New World, indicating that the American Church received its existence from the Catholic Church through the Church of England.

Outside of this hemisphere is a band, with the names of the six undisputed General Councils, of the ancient Church. This band runs all round the globe, signifying the Catholicity of the true Faith.

From this band, on the outside, spring twelve oak leaves, and between them are twelve twigs, each bearing three acorns with burnished kernels. This use of the English oak sets forth the English Church growing outwards, and carrying her Catholicity with her wherever she goes, in every direction. The *twelve* is the number of Apostolic fulness and perfection, and the *three* is a reference to the docrine of the Trinity.

The rim bears the inscription, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." It begins and ends at a jewelled cross, composed of five amethysts, four topazes, eight pearls, and eight small garnets, all clustered within a circle, the cross itself thus forming a crown of glory. The words are divided by large stones. As they refer to spiritual gifts, which are of infinite variety, no two are alike.

Outside the inscription is a bold cable-moulding, the finish of which shows that it is a three-fold cord, not easily broken. This symbolizes the three Orders of the Apostolic Ministry.

Outside this moulding, again, is a margin of leaves all growing outward, showing the vigorous outward growth of the Church all the world over.

On the under side of the rim is a plain Latin inscription, more specifically detailing the circumstances of the occasion which called forth this gift from the American to the English Church. It runs thus :—

"✠ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ matri, per manus Apostolicas reverendissimi Georgii Augusti Selwyn, Dei gratiâ, Episcopi Lichfieldensis, pacis et benevolentiæ internuncii, ejusdemque auctoris, hoc pietatis testimonium filii Americani dederunt. ✠"

In the following lines, suggested by the foregoing description, and written by the Bishop of Lincoln, the Church of England is represented as returning thanks to the Church of America, for this pious offering :—

Quod caræ mittis, carissima Filia, Matri
Accipimus sanctæ pignus amicitiæ.
Dat dextram veteri novus Orbis; Nata Parenti;
Miscet et Occiduum Sol Oriente jubar.
Pontus Atlantiaco quamvis interfluat æstu,
Littora velivolis consociantur aquis;
Ecce! Ratis Christi medium translabitur æquor,
Alba ferunt Labarum carbasa; prora Crucem.
Funis Apostolico fultum gestamine malum
Ordinibus binis junctus utrinque tenet;
Navem per scopulos Oracula Sancta gubernant;
Sic tutam sulcat per maris arva viam:
Angliacos linquit portus ferturque Carina
Americæ placido suscipienda sinu.
Aspice! qua medium lancis complectitur orbem
Mystica cælatis clara corona notis!
Nomina senarum Synodorum pristina cerno,
Quæ fixam placitis explicuere fidem.
Germinat hæc circum quercu diadema Britannâ;
Donaque fert Trino frons duodena Deo:
Multicolore nitent diversæ lumine gemmæ;
Undique sic radians lucet Amore Fides.
Crux zonam gemmata aperitque et claudit; Amoris
Nam Crux principium est, Crux quoque finis erit.

Fraternis veluti triplex amplexibus orbis,
Cuncta Ministerium cingit Apostolicum:
Denique ut externo diffusæ in margine frondes,
Sic Christi Vitis tendit in omne solum.

Ergo Te Genetrix, carissima Nata, salutat,
Et pia de grato pectore vota refert;
Pacis in æterno constringat fœdere corda
Cordibus Angliacis Americana Deus!
Una Fides, unus Christus, nos Spiritus unus,
Unus et Ipse Suo jungat amore Pater!
Sic, ubi transierint mortalia sæcula, Cœli
Nos una accipiat non peritura Domus!

TRANSLATION of the foregoing; by the Rev. W. J. IRONS, D.D.

I.

That which thou sendest, Daughter mine, I as thy Mother take;
A Pledge of Amity Divine, I prize it for thy sake.
The New World greets the Old to-day, and Child to Parent calls,
While from the Western Sun a ray of glory eastward falls;
What though between with angry sound the vex'd Atlantic raves,
In union still our coasts are bound, while vessels skim the waves.
For lo, the Bark of Christ is there, the mighty deep to plough,
The white sails bear her standard fair, the Cross is at her prow;
Her cordage strong upholds her mast of Apostolic might;
And two-fold Orders firm and fast on either side unite,
Secure among the rocks she glides—the Oracles of light
Through pathless floods her starry guides—she steers her course aright;

From England's ports she faced the sea, and sought the distant West,
Welcomed, America, by thee, to peace upon thy breast!

II.

Mark how the sphere that lies between, shines in this diadem;
The circlet of Thy Gift is seen, adorn'd with many a gem;
That pristine sign, that six-fold name, the ancient Synods pure,
Engraven there shall long proclaim the Faith for ever sure;
That wreath of British oak, with all its twelve bright offshoots scann'd,
To us the sacred Twelve recall, the Apostolic band:
Those precious stones of various name, with various colours bright,
On every side flash forth and gleam, like Faith in Love's sweet light:
The jewell'd Cross begins and ends the bright and sparkling zone,
The Cross, from whence all Love descends—our First and Last alone!
In brotherhood, all pure and free, wherever man is found,
The Apostolic Ministry girdles the Earth around,
So here, along the margin's slant, the fruitful branches stand,
Even as the Vine which CHRIST did plant shall spread from land to land.

EPODE.

And now Thy Mother, Child of mine, thus greets Thee from afar;
Echoes the hope that such Design no discord ever mar!
In one blest bond of endless peace, so may GOD bind us too,
The heart of loved America, with England's hearts so true!
One Faith, One CHRIST, be ever ours, One SPIRIT from above,
And the one FATHER over all, unite us in HIS LOVE!
So, when the ages pass, and leave things mortal to decay,
May one unfading Home receive Our Spirits in That Day!

LETTER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD COMMISSIONERS,

ON THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THEIR INTENTION TO MAKE STATUTES FOR BRASENOSE AND LINCOLN COLLEGES.

As Visitor of two Colleges in the University of Oxford, I received a letter from the Commissioners appointed under the "University of Oxford and Cambridge Act," 1877, informing me of their intention to frame Statutes for those Colleges. The following was my reply to that communication :—

RISEHOLME, LINCOLN,
18*th January*, 1879.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,

I have the honour to acknowledge a communication from you, dated January 11th last, in which you inform me, as Visitor of Brasenose College, and of Lincoln College, in the University of Oxford, that by virtue of the powers with which you have been invested by the "University of Oxford and Cambridge Act," 1877 (40 & 41 Victoria, chapter 48), you intend to proceed to make Statutes for those two Colleges.

Those two Colleges were founded by Bishops of Lincoln, and were commended by them to the care of their successors in the See of Lincoln. I should not therefore be discharging the duties of the trust committed to me with respect to them, if I did not request permission to submit to you some remarks concerning those Societies.

Inasmuch also as in the Act of Parliament, by which your Commission is constituted, it is provided that notice should be given of your intention to frame Statutes, to the Visitors of Colleges in Oxford, and you have now announced

to me that intention accordingly; it seems to be contemplated by the Legislature, and to be implied in your announcement, that the Visitors should communicate to you such observations as may seem not unworthy of consideration.

Those two Colleges,—as appears from their Statutes,—were designed by their respective Founders to be Seminaries of Religion, and to be Schools of the Church of England. They were erected and endowed by Bishops of the Church for the encouragement of Sacred Literature and of Theological learning; and for the training and maintenance of persons, either in Holy Orders, or destined for Holy Orders, in the Church.

In the original Statutes of Brasenose College, it is ordered, that all the Fellows should be in Holy Orders within seven years after their admission to their Master's Degree, or else resign their Fellowships.

The Statutes of Lincoln College (even as revised in the year 1855) enjoin that all the Fellows, except two, should be in Holy Orders within ten years after their admission to a Fellowship.

The Statutes of both these Colleges prescribe that their Heads should be in Holy Orders.

Such, my Lords and Gentlemen, were the designs and injunctions of the Founders of those Colleges: and the Endowments which they bestowed upon them were given in faith that those designs and injunctions would be fulfilled.

The Endowments formerly provided for the encouragement of Sacred Learning and Theological Study in the Church of England have been much diminished in late years by the sequestration of more than half the revenues of our Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches. It is indeed to be acknowledged with thankfulness, that those Capitular revenues have not been secularized; but have been applied to religious purposes, especially to the relief of spiritual destitution in populous places.

Still it cannot be doubted, that, from this and other causes, the Church of England is now in danger of declining

from the high position which she held among the Churches of Christendom, as possessing a learned Clergy, well-trained and qualified to refute erroneous opinions, and to defend the Christian Faith, and also, to contribute largely to the advancement of Literature and Science.

The Bishops of the Church have too much reason to regret, from their own personal experience, that our two ancient Universities do not now supply a due proportion of Candidates for Holy Orders, and that the average attainments, in sound scholarship and theological learning, of our future Clergy will probably be far below what is to be desired.

This is the more to be lamented, because, at the present time, our national Institutions and our domestic peace and happiness are exposed to peril from the spread of Unbelief, and from the growth of Romanism.

It would therefore be a public calamity to the Church and Nation, if the Endowments of our Universities and Colleges were now to be more largely abstracted, than is already unhappily the case, from the purposes to which their Founders assigned them, namely, the maintenance of the Christian Faith, and the promotion of Theological Learning, and the training of ministers for the service of the Church, and were alienated to secular uses, however excellent in themselves.

Such a diversion of those revenues would, I conceive, be also very injurious to our Colleges as places of national Education for the higher classes of society.

I do not mean to say, that Heads of Houses, and Fellows of Colleges in our Universities, being Clergymen, and being bound as such by their Ordination Vows to hold and teach the Christian Faith, and to lead Christian lives, and thus to train young men by their practice as well as by precept, will always fulfil those engagements. But the fact, that the principal members of the Governing Bodies of our Colleges have been in Holy Orders, and were pledged as such by solemn stipulations, has inspired public confidence in their system of government; and it cannot be doubted, that the Colleges of England, as places of higher Education, owe much of their efficiency and success to their connexion with the Church of England. And if that connexion were severed

or weakened, English parents and English families would, I believe, have reason to rue the result.

The condition of other Countries, where the endowments of the Church and of Academic Corporations have been secularized, and where the University and Collegiate life is not animated by the spirit of Christianity, may serve as a warning to England.

I am fully aware that there are some distinguished persons in our Colleges and Universities, who would look on this separation from the Church without regret. But I may be allowed to observe, that our Colleges and Universities do not exist for the sake of any men—or any set of men,—however eminent at any particular time, but for the sake of the English Nation. All Englishmen have a vested interest in the welfare of our ancient Colleges and Universities, and in the maintenance of their character as seminaries of sound Learning and religious Education. They are a noble heritage from the past; they are among the fairest ornaments of our country; and they are among the surest pledges of her strength and glory for the future. And the essence, I venture to think, of their moral and spiritual life and vigour, and even of their intellectual power in the highest sense of the term, is their connexion with Christianity.

As Visitor of one of the two Colleges, for which, as you inform me, you are now about to frame Statutes, I received a communication from the Governing Body of that College eight years ago, in which I was desired to comply with the request of the majority of that Governing Body (a small one) that the particular Statute of the College should be repealed, which prescribes that the Head of the College should be in Holy Orders.

I declined to give my assent to that proposal, which therefore fell to the ground. Let me state the reasons for that refusal, which were thus expressed in my answer to the application:—"The Founders of your College designed that it should be a religious Society; and for the maintenance of its religious character, it is, I think, very important that the Head of the College should (as is required by the Statutes) be qualified to preach the Word of God, and to administer

the Holy Communion to those Students who are committed to his charge, and of whom he will have to give an account hereafter; and that he should thus be reminded of his own sacred duty towards them. And I should not be discharging my duty aright, as Visitor of the College, to its Founders and Benefactors, and to the College itself, and to those Parents who send their sons to be educated there, if I were to give my assent to a proposal which, in my judgment, would have a manifest tendency to impair the character of the College as a place of Christian Education." Subsequent reflexion has confirmed me in the opinions which I then expressed, and I should feel much regret if I had complied with that request, and had given my consent to that proposal.

My Lords and Gentlemen, in this and similar matters my duty as Visitor[1] of those two Colleges (founded by Bishops of Lincoln and entrusted by them to the care of their successors) is now at an end. It has passed into your hands. To you is committed the responsible office of making Statutes for these two Colleges, which, during the course of centuries since their foundation, have done good service to the Country and the Church. Their future destinies depend upon you.

I am thankful to believe, that the provisions of the Legislative Statute[2] under which you act, will enable and encourage you to maintain the religious character of these Societies. The high character of the persons, of whom your Commission is composed, inspires confident hope of good results to

[1] The Visitor, concurrently with the Governing Body of the Colleges, was empowered, under certain conditions, to frame new Statutes for the College; and also to prevent any old Statute from being altered, or any new one from being made.

[2] See the "Universities Act" (sects. 14 and 15). "The Commissioners in making a Statute for the University or College, shall have regard to the main design of the Founder, except where it has ceased to be observed before the passing of this Act. . . . They shall have regard to the interests of education, religion, learning, and research; and in the case of a College or Hall shall have regard in the first instance to the maintenance of the College or Hall for those purposes."

be derived from it; and I earnestly pray that the Divine Blessing may rest on your consultations and endeavours for the benefit of those Institutions.

I have the honour to be,
My Lords and Gentlemen,
With much respect,
Your obedient and faithful Servant,
C. Lincoln,
Visitor of Brasenose and Lincoln Colleges, Oxford.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

JULY, 1878.

THE following Circular, addressed to the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, who were invited to the Conference, announced the order of its proceedings, and the subjects to be considered at it :—

The Conference will open on TUESDAY, JULY 2nd, at 11.0 a.m., with a Service in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, at which the Bishops are requested to attend in their Robes. The Service will consist of the Holy Communion, with a Sermon by the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK [which has now been published].

The following is the arrangement of the subjects and the days on which they will be discussed :—

TUESDAY, JULY 2nd, 1.30 P.M.—4.45 P.M.	SUBJECT I.—The best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.
WEDNESDAY, JULY 3rd, 10.45 A.M.—4.45 P.M.	SUBJECT II.—Voluntary Boards of Arbitration for Churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable.
	SUBJECT III.—The relation to each other of Missionary Bishops and of Missionaries, in various branches of the Anglican Communion, acting in the same country.
THURSDAY, JULY 4th, 10.45 A.M.—4.45 P.M.	SUBJECT IV.—The position of Anglican Chaplains and Chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere.
	SUBJECT V.—Modern forms of Infidelity, and the best means of dealing with them.

FRIDAY, JULY 5th, 10.45 A.M.—4.45 P.M. { SUBJECT VI.—The condition, progress and needs of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.

The Conference will open each day with Prayers in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace.

The Conference will be resumed on Tuesday, July 23rd, at 10.45 A.M., to receive and discuss the Reports of the various Committees; and will close at 4.45 P.M. on Friday, July 26th.

On Saturday, July 27th, a closing Service will be held in St. Paul's Cathedral, at 11 A.M.

[The Sermon was preached by the Right Rev. William Bacon Stevens, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania, and has been published].

"A Letter from the Bishops, including the Reports adopted by the Conference," was subsequently published under authority.

In order that foreign Christian Communions in Eastern and Western Christendom, might be made acquainted with such resolutions of the Conference as would manifest to them the true, Scriptural, Primitive, and Catholic character of the Anglican Church, it was thought desirable that they should be translated into Greek and Latin and circulated; and accordingly the following Translations were made by me into those languages, by command of His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY, the President of the Conference.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΕΚΑΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ

Ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ συνηθροισμένων, ἐν Παλατίῳ Λαμβηθανῷ, μηνὶ Ἰουλίῳ, ἔτει ϡωοή (1878).

Τοῖς πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ χαίρειν ἐν Κυρίῳ.

Ἡμεῖς Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι, Μητροπολῖται, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐπίσκοποι τῆς ἁγίας Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, συγκοινωνοῦντες ὁλοκλήρως τῇ Ἀγγλικανῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἑκατὸν ὄντες τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἅπαντες ἐπισκοπὴν παροικιῶν ἐπιτηδεύοντες, ἢ νομίμως ἐπισκοπικὰ τέλη ἐν αὐταῖς ἐπιτετραμμένοι, συνελθόντες, πολλοὶ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῶν μακροτάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης κλιμάτων, ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ Λαμβηθανῷ, ἔτει τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνσαρκώσεως ϡωοή (1878), προεδρεύοντος σεβασμιωτάτου Ἀρχιβάλδου Κάμπβελλ, τῇ θείᾳ προνοίᾳ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Καντουαρίας, Ἐπισκόπων ὅλης Ἀγγλίας πρωτοθρόνου, μετειληφότες, ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ εἰρημένου παλατίου, τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ προσευχαῖς ἡνωμένοι ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος χειραγωγίας, ἐξέτασιν πεποιήκαμεν διαφόρων ζητημάτων ἡμῖν προβεβλημένων, ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας σχέσιν ἐν διαφόροις τοῦ κόσμου μέρεσιν.

Περὶ τούτων τῶν ζητημάτων σπουδαίως διὰ πλειόνων ἡμερῶν συμβεβουλευκότες, παρατιθέμεθα ταῦν τοῖς πιστοῖς τὰ συμπεράσματα ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεδογμένα.[1]

[1] Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μεταφράσει, τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐκλογὴν πεποιήκαμεν, τῶν μάλιστα τῇ καθόλου Ἐκκλησίᾳ προσηκόντων· ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἀγγλικῷ τῆς Ἐπιστολῆς ἀρχετύπῳ αἱ τῶν ἐπιτροπῶν τοῦ συμβουλίου ἐκθέσεις (*Reports of Committees*), ἀπὸ τοῦ Συμβουλίου δοκιμασθεῖσαι, ὁλοτελεῖς εὑρίσκονται.

Ἐνθυμούμενοι τὴν ἐπιτηδειοτάτην μέθοδον πρὸς τὴν τήρησιν τῆς ἑνότητος τῶν διαφόρων τῆς ἡμετέρας κοινωνίας ἐκκλησιῶν, πρώτιστα πάντων ἀναγνωρίζομεν, μετ' ἐγκαρδίου εὐχαριστίας τῷ Παντοκράτορι Θεῷ, τὴν οὐσιώδη καὶ ἐναργῆ ἑνότητα, ἐν ᾗ ἡ Ἀγγλικανὴ Ἐκκλησία, καὶ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι μετ' αὐτῆς ὁρατῶς συγκοινωνοῦσαι, διατελοῦσι συνημμέναι. Ἡνωμέναι ὑπὸ μιᾶς θείας Κεφαλῆς, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς μιᾶς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, κατέχουσαι τὴν μίαν πίστιν, ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις Γραφαῖς ἀποκεκαλυμμένην, ἐν τοῖς Συμβόλοις ὡρισμένην, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆθεν Ἐκκλησίας κεκρατημένην, δεχόμεναι τὰς αὐτὰς κανονικὰς Γραφὰς τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ τῆς καινῆς Διαθήκης, ὡς πάντα τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀναγκαῖα περιεχούσας, αὗται αἱ ἡμέτεραι Ἐκκλησίαι τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον κηρύσσουσι, τῶν αὐτῶν θεόθεν διατεταγμένων μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσι διὰ τῆς ὑπηρεσίας τῶν αὐτῶν ἀποστολικῶν βαθμῶν, καὶ προσκυνοῦσι τῷ αὐτῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατέρι, διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ θείῳ Πνεύματι, πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπιχορηγουμένῳ, πρὸς τὸ ὁδηγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

Ἀμέσως μὲν οὖν μετὰ ταύτης τῆς ἑνότητος, ὑπῆρξεν ἐν ἡμετέραις ἐκκλησίαις ἐκείνη συνηθείας, διατάξεως, καὶ λειτουργίας διαφορὰ, ἥτις ἀναγκαίως ἐκφύεται ἐξ ἀσκήσεως τῆς ἐξουσίας, τῆς ἑκάστῃ μερικῇ ἢ ἐθνικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσηκούσης, τοῦ διατάσσειν, παραχαράσσειν, καὶ ἀκυροῦν θεσμοὺς καὶ τελετὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς, ὑπ' ἀνθρωπίνης ἐξουσίας διατεταγμένας, μόνον ὥστε πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γίγνεσθαι.

Ἀσμένως μὲν ὁμολογοῦμεν μηδεμίαν εἰσέτι εὑρίσκεσθαι μερίμνης αἰτίαν, διὰ ταύτην τὴν διαφωνίαν. Ὅμως μέντοι ἐπιπόθησίς τις νεωστὶ ἐπιπολὺ αἰσθήσει καὶ λόγῳ πεφανέρωται, ὡς ἐννοητέα καὶ προσαπτέα εἴη ὄργανά τινα, πρὸς τὸ ἐκκόπτειν, εἰ τύχοι, ἀφορμὰς

διχοστασίας, καὶ πρὸς τὴν λαμπροτέραν ἀπόδειξιν καὶ αὔξησιν τῆς ἀληθινῆς καὶ οὐσιώδους ὁμονοίας ἐν ἡμετέραις ἐκκλησίαις ὑπαρχούσης.

Τὸ πρῶτον μὲν εἰς νοῦν ἀνερχόμενον ὄργανον τοιαύτης ἑνώσεως εὐλόγως ἂν εἴη ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ, ἀρχὴν ἔχον ἀπὸ τῶν θεοφόρων ἀποστόλων, συνέζευξεν ἁπάσας τὰς Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐν μιᾷ ἀδιαιρέτῳ καὶ ὁρατῇ κοινωνίᾳ. Ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν ἡ συνάθροισις ἀληθινῶς οἰκουμενικῆς Συνόδου, πρὸς ὁποίαν ἡ Ἀγγλικανὴ Ἐκκλησία πάντοτε ἐπηγγέλλετο ἑτοίμη εἶναι συνέρχεσθαι, ἐν τῇ σημερινῇ τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ καταστάσει, δυστυχῶς μὲν, ἄλλα φανερῶς, πέφυκεν ἀμήχανος. Αἱ μὲν ἀπορίαι, αἵτινες παρακολουθήσειαν ἂν τῇ συνελεύσει συνόδου ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀγγλικανῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συγκεκροτημένης, καίπερ ἀνόμοιοι καὶ μετριώτεραι τῶν εἰρημένων, ὅμως μέντοι εἰσὶ βαρύτεραι ἢ συγχωρῆσαι ταύτης τῆς μεθόδου, ἐν τῷ νῦν χρόνῳ, συναίνεσιν. Ἀλλ' ἡ πεῖρα, δὶς γεγονυῖα, συμβουλίου ἐπισκόπων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Καντουαρίας Ἀρχιεπισκόπου συγκεκλημένων, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προεδρεύοντος συνηθροισμένων, ἐλπίδα ἡμῖν παρέχει αὐτομάτου λύσεως προβλήματος μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἀλύτου, δηλονότι συναθροίσεως καὶ συμβουλεύσεως τοποτηρητῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῇ τε θέσει καὶ τῇ διοικήσει διαφερουσῶν.

Ἐγγύτατα μετὰ τὴν ἑνότητα ἐν τῇ πίστει, τῇ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ, πεπεισμένοι ἐσμὲν τὴν θρησκείας κοινωνίαν ἰσχυρότατον εἶναι σύνδεσμον πρὸς τὴν σύναψιν τῶν χριστιανικῶν ἑταιριῶν· καὶ καλῶς μεμνημένοι ὅτι τὸ ἡμέτερον τῶν δημοσίων προσευχῶν βιβλίον, μετά τινων οἵων δήποτε ἀλλοιώσεων ἐν πάσαις ἡμετέραις ἐκκλησίαις κατεχόμενον, ἐξαίρετόν τι ἑνότητος γέγονε φυλακτήριον, νουθετεῖν ἀξιοῦμεν τοὺς ἡμεδαποὺς, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ θρησκείας κοινωνία κινδυνεύοι ἂν λυμαίνεσθαι δι' ὑπερβολικῶν ἱερουργίας παραλλάξεων. Ἡ ἐσωτερικὴ μὲν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἑνότης ταύτῃ τῇ θρησκείας κοινωνίᾳ, καθὼς πεποίθαμεν, ὑπη-

ρετήσει· ἀλλ' ὅμως, (καίπερ ἐννοοῦντες ὅτι τοία τις ἀμφιλαφὴς λειτουργικῶν τελετῶν ἐλευθερία αἱρετή ἐστιν, οἵα πάσαις ταῖς νομίμαις θρησκευτικῶν αἰσθημάτων ἀποδείξεσιν εὐρυχωρίαν ἂν χαρίσαιτο,) τὴν ἀποστολικὴν παραγγελίαν ἐπικαλούμεθα, "πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γιγνέσθω," καὶ τὸν καθολικὸν κανόνα ἐπιμαρτυρόμεθα, τὸν διορίζοντα εὐταξίαν καὶ πειθαρχίαν, καίπερ μετ' αὐταπαρνήσεως ἰδίων προσκλίσεων καὶ αἰσθήσεων ἀποδιδομένας, ὡς χριστιανικῆς ἑνότητος θεμέλια, καὶ ὡς ἀναγκαίας πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς πίστεως νικηφόρον ὑπεράσπισιν. Τοιγαροῦν οὐ παυσόμεθα τοιαῦτα νουθετοῦντες πρὶν ἐκφωνῆσαι ἐκτενῶς τὴν ἐλπίδα, ὅτι πάντα τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐκκλησιῶν τέκνα, ὁποίαις τισὶν οὖν θεωρίαις διαφέροντα, μέλλουσιν ὁμολογεῖν τὸ καθῆκον τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι, διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν, ἐν θεσμοῖς καὶ τελεταῖς θρησκευτικαῖς, ταῖς ἐξουσιαστικαῖς κρίσεσιν τῆς μερικῆς ἢ ἐθνικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὑφ' ἧς θείᾳ προνοίᾳ τυγχάνωσι κατῳκισμένα· καὶ ὅτι ἀφέξονται παντὸς πράγματος εἰς ἀλλοτρίωσιν ἢ ἐρεθισμὸν τείνοντος, καὶ οσήμερον θερμῶς προσεύξονται, ἵνα τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα πάντα τῆς ἐκκλησίας μέλη ὁδηγῇ εἰς τὸ λογίζεσθαι καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι πάντοτε ἃ δεῖ, καὶ ἡμᾶς πάντας συνάπτῃ τῇ φιλαδελφικῇ ἐκείνῃ ἀγάπῃ, ἥτις ἐστὶν αὐτὸς εἰρήνης καὶ πασῶν ἀρετῶν σύνδεσμος.

* * * *

Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Παντοκράτορι Θεῷ, ὅτι σεμνοπρεπής τις διαμαρτυρία ἐξήχηται ἀπὸ πάνυ πολλῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ κοινοτήτων χριστιανῶν καθ' ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, κατὰ τῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίας καθέδρας πλεονεκτημάτων, καὶ κατὰ τῶν νεωτερικῶν δογμάτων, ὑπ' ἐξουσίας αὐτῆς διωρισμένων.

Ἡ Ἀγγλικανὴ Ἐκκλησία ὀφείλει πᾶσαν συμπάθειαν ἐκκλησίαις κοινῇ, καὶ χριστιανοῖς ἰδίᾳ, διαμαρτυρομένοις κατὰ τούτων πλανημάτων, καὶ στενοχωρουμένοις, εἰ τύχοι, ὑπ' ἀποριῶν ἐξάλλων, διὰ τῶν

τῆς ἀπιστίας προσβολῶν, ἅμα καὶ διὰ τῶν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπιχειρημάτων.

Ἡμεῖς ὁμολογοῦμεν ἕνα μόνον Μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, Ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ὅς ἐστιν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀπωθούμεθα, ὡς ἐναντίον ταῖς Γραφαῖς καὶ τῇ καθολικῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πᾶν ὁτιοῦν δόγμα, ὅπερ καθιστάναι ἄλλους μεσίτας ἀντ' Ἐκείνου τολμήσειεν ἄν, ἢ ἀφαιρεῖν ὁτιοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς θείας μεγαλειότητος τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς θεότητος ἐν Αὐτῷ κατοικοῦντος, καὶ τιμὴν ἄπειρον παρέχοντος τῇ ἀμώμῳ ἐκείνῃ θυσίᾳ, τῇ ἅπαξ ὑπ' Αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου ἁμαρτιῶν ἐπὶ σταυροῦ προσενεχθείσης.

Χρεωστοῦμεν οὖν νουθετεῖν τοὺς πιστοὺς, τὸ ἔργον ὁ κατείργασται ὁ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπος ἔτει 1870 ἐν τῇ Βατικανῇ συνόδῳ, δι' οὗ ὑπεροχῆς ἀντεποιήσατο ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, τήν τε πίστιν καὶ τὰ ἤθη, ἐπὶ προσχήματι ἀπλανησίας ἑαυτῷ ἐφαρπασθείσης, ἐπέμβασιν γεγονέναι τῶν ἀξιωμάτων τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ προσηκόντων.

Γνώριμοι πᾶσίν εἰσιν οἱ κανόνες, καθ' οὓς ἡ Ἀγγλικανὴ Ἐκκλησία ἑαυτὴν μετερρύθμισεν. Ἀνακηρύττομεν τὴν αὐτάρκειαν καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῶν ἱερῶν Γραφῶν, ὡς ὁριστικὴν πίστεως στάθμην, καὶ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ λαῷ παραγγέλλομεν σπουδαίαν αὐτῶν μελέτην· τὴν πίστιν ἡμῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀρχαίων Συμβόλων φωναῖς ὁμολογοῦμεν· τὸ ἀποστολικὸν τάγμα Ἐπισκόπων, Πρεσβυτέρων καὶ Διακόνων κατέχομεν· τὴν ἔννομον ἐλευθερίαν μερικῶν ἢ ἐθνικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν διαβεβαιούμεθα· τῷ λαῷ ἡμῶν ἐγχειρίζομεν, ἐν τῇ ἐγχωρίῳ αὐτοῦ διαλέκτῳ, βιβλίον προσευχῶν δημοσίων καὶ τελετῶν, καὶ τῶν μυστηρίων ἱερουργίας, κατὰ τὰ ἄριστα καὶ παλαιότατα χριστιανικῆς πίστεως καὶ λατρείας ἀρχέτυπα.

Ταῦτα τὰ ἡμῶν μαρτυρήματα ἐνώπιον τῆς οἰκουμένης

ἀναπτύσσεται, γιγνωσκόμενα καὶ ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων.

Ἀσμένως οὖν ἀσπαζόμεθα πᾶσαν πεῖραν μεταρρυθμίσεως κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς ἀρχαίας ἐκκλησίας· στερεὰν ταὐτότητα οὐκ ἀπαιτοῦμεν· ἀνωφελεῖς διχοστασίας παραιτούμεθα· πᾶσιν τοῖς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐφελκομένοις ἐν τῷ ἐπιχειρεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθερῶσαι ἀπὸ ζυγοῦ πλάνης καὶ δεισιδαιμονίας πᾶσαν βοήθειαν προθύμως προτείνομεν, καὶ οἷα ἑαυτοῖς προνόμια εἴη ἀρεστὰ, καὶ ἡμετέροις κανόσιν, τοῖς ἐν ἡμετέραις διατυπώσεσιν ὡρισμένοις, σύμφωνα, ἐθελόντως προκομίζομεν.

* * * *

Περὶ τῶν ζητημάτων ἡμῖν παρατεθέντων ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ Γάμου νόμων ἐμφανίζομεν, ὅτι τὰς ἀπορίας ἐπιγιγνώσκοντες, ἐν αἷς ἔνιαι ἐκκλησίαι ἐμπλέκονται, διὰ τῶν θεσμῶν τῆς τοπικῆς νομοθεσίας, νομίζομεν ὅτι δεῖ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆς γνώμην, τὴν τοῦ Γάμου ἁγιωσύνην διαφυλάττειν, κατὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ ῥήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁρισθέντα, καὶ καθὰ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησία μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ταῦτα δέδεκται.

Ἀναθεωροῦντες τοὺς λυγροὺς διαλογισμοὺς, περὶ τελετῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, δι' ὧν ἔνια τῶν ἡμετέρων πλήθη χαλεπῶς τεθορύβηνται, διαβεβαιούμεθα τὸν κανόνα, ὁρίζοντα μηδὲν δεῖν νεωτερίζειν, ἐν τῇ εἰθισμένῃ θρησκείας διατάξει, κατὰ τῆς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου νουθεσίας.

Λοιπὸν ἐνθυμούμενοι καινοτομίας τινὰς, τῇ τε πράξει καὶ τῇ διδαχῇ, περὶ τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως, διϊσχυριζόμεθα, τὰς τῆς Ἀγγλικανῆς κοινωνίας Ἐκκλησίας κρατεῖν βεβαίως τοὺς κανόνας περὶ τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις Γραφαῖς ἀποδεδειγμένους, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἐκκλησίας συνωμολογημένους, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀγγλικῇ Μεταρρυθμίσει ἀνακεκαινωμένους· καὶ ἐσκεμμένως ἐγ-

νώκαμεν, μηδενὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπηρέτῃ ἐξεῖναι ἀπαιτεῖν ἐκ τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν φοιτώντων, διὰ τὴν τῆς αὐτῶν λύπης ἀνάπτυξιν, ἁπασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστων ἐξαρίθμησιν, ἢ ἰδίαν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐκβασανίζειν, πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας εὐχαριστίας μεταλήψεως, ἢ ἐπιτάσσειν ἢ καὶ παραινεῖν τὴν τῆς συνήθους τῷ ἱερεῖ ἐξομολογήσεως ἐπιτήδευσιν, ἢ διδάσκειν ὅτι τοία ἐπιτήδευσις, ἢ τὸ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῇ οὑτωσὶ καλουμένῃ ἱερέως χειραγωγίᾳ, ἀναγκαῖά ἐστι προπαιδεύματα πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀνωτάτης πνευματικῆς ζωῆς ἐπίβασιν. Ὅμως μέντοι οὐδαμῶς ἐννοοῦμεν ἐπιτέμνειν τὴν ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῶν δημοσίων προσευχῶν, πρὸς τὸν βεβαρημένων συνειδήσεων ἐπικουφισμὸν, ἐπιχορηγίαν προνενοημένην.

Ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ συμπεράσματα εἰς ἃ κατηντήκαμεν, περὶ τῶν ἡμῖν προβεβλημένων ζητημάτων, ἐν οἷς τὰ πάντων τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τέκνων ἁπτόμενα ταῖς συνόδοις ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις καθ' ἑκάστην κυβερνητικαῖς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς τοῖς πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλοφρόνως σαφηνίζομεν.

Οὐκ ἀντιποιούμεθα τοῦ κατακυριεύειν ἐν κλήροις, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τῷ ἡμετέρῳ συμβουλίῳ ἀρέσαντα συνίσταμεν τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ τῇ συνειδήσει τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος πεφωτισμένων, ἐκτενῶς Θεῷ προσευχόμενοι, ἵνα πάντες οἱ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπικαλούμενοι, μιᾷ γνώμῃ καὶ μιᾷ κοινωνίᾳ ἡνωμένοι, τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἅπαξ τοῖς ἁγίοις παραδοθεῖσαν βεβαίως κρατῶσιν, καὶ τῷ ἑνὶ αὐτῶν Κυρίῳ ἐν ἑνὶ ἀφθαρσίας καὶ ἀγάπης πνεύματι λατρεύωσιν. Ἀμήν.

Ὑπέγραψα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ συμβουλίου,

ΑΡΧΙΒΑΛΔΟΣ ΚΑΜΠΒΕΛΛ,

Ὁ Καντουαρίας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος.

EPISTOLA CENTUM EPISCOPORUM

IN ANGLIA CONGREGATORUM, IN PALATIO LAMBETHANO, MENSE JULIO, ANNO SALUTIS MDCCCLXXVIII.

Fidelibus in Christo salutem in Domino.

Nos Archiepiscopi, Metropolitani, aliique Episcopi Sanctæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, centum numero, cum Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ plenariè communicantes, universi super Diœceses jurisdictionem Episcopalem exercitantes, vel ad Episcopalia munia in eis obeunda legitimè delegati, multi nostrûm ex remotissimis orbis terrarum regionibus, congregati in Palatio Lambethano, anno salutis MDCCCLXXVIII. præsidente Reverendissimo Præsule Archibaldo Campbell, Divinâ Providentiâ Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ Primate, participes facti, in dicti Palatii sacello, Sacrosanctorum Mysteriorum Corporis et Sanguinis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, et orationibus adunati ad Spiritûs Sancti directionem impetrandam, de variis præfinitis quæstionibus consilium inivimus cœtui nostro propositis, ad statum Ecclesiæ pertinentibus per diversas mundi partes diffusæ.

His quæstionibus seriò deliberandis complures dies impendimus, jamque determinationes earum a nobis approbatas fidelibus in Christo commendamus.[1]

[1] In hâc Latinâ interpretatione eorum capitulorum præcipuè delectum fecimus quæ ad Ecclesiam Universalem attinere quodammodo videbantur. In Anglico autem archetypo Relationes Delegationum (*Reports of Committees*), a Cœtu comprobatæ, plenariæ reperiuntur.

Quæ sit optima ratio pensitantes unitatis conservandæ inter varias nostræ Communionis Ecclesias, primùm omnium Deo Omnipotenti gratias agentes quàm maximas, manifestam unitatem agnoscimus, quâ Ecclesia Anglicana, et Ecclesiæ cum illâ visibiliter communicantes, jugiter connexæ permanserunt.

Conjunctæ invicem sub Uno Divino Capite, Jesu Christo, in unius Catholicæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ societate, firmiter tenentes unam Fidem, in Verbo Dei revelatam, Symbolis definitam, et a Primitivâ Ecclesiâ constanter conservatam, easdem Canonicas Scripturas Veteris et Novi Testamenti recipientes, utpote omnia continentes ad salutem sempiternam necessaria, hæ nostræ Ecclesiæ eundem Dei Sermonem prædicant, eorundem Sacramentorum, divinitus institutorum, per eorundem ordinum Apostolicorum ministerium dispensatorum, participes sunt, et Eundem Deum et Patrem venerantur, per Eundem Dominum Jesum Christum, in Eodem Spiritu Sancto super omnibus fidelibus effuso ad ducendos eos in omnem veritatem.

Verùm enimverò cum hâc unitate consociata nunquam non extitit ea consuetudinum, disciplinæ et rituum varietas, quæ ab illâ prærogativâ enasci solet, quam quævis Ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, jure sibi vindicat; scilicet constituendi, immutandi, atque abrogandi cærimonias vel ritus Ecclesiasticos, humanâ tantum auctoritate ordinatos, modò omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

Libenter quidem profitemur, nullam reverà etiamnum sollicitudinis causam in hâc diversitate reperiri. Constat autem, votum aliquorum animis nuper conceptum vocibus quoque passim significatum fuisse,

hoc præsertim intuitu, ut rationes quædam actu efficaces a nobis adhibeantur, ad occasiones discordiæ præcidendas, et ad illam genuinam et essentialem unitatem, quæ nostras Ecclesias indies supercrescentes complectitur, manifestandam amplius atque fovendam.

Primùm quidem hujus concordiæ tuendæ illa in mentem venit ratio, quæ inde ab Apostolis ipsis divinitùs inspiratis originem ducens, Ecclesiis omnibus in eâdem individuâ et visibili unitate continendis diu inserviit. Hodierna autem rei Christianæ ea est conditio, infausta quidem sed manifesta, ut Concilium verè Œcumenicum, ad quod Ecclesia Anglicana se paratam esse convenire semper professa est, convocari non possit. Difficultates quidem quæ impedimento sunt quominus Synodus ex omnibus Anglicanis Ecclesiis conflata congregetur, re diversæ et minus graves, nimiæ tamen nobis videntur, quàm ut illa ratio unitatis conservandæ a nobis commendetur.

Aliud autem experimentum, secundâ jam vice factum, congregatio scilicet Episcoporum ab Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi convocatorum, et Eo præsidente deliberantium, spem saltem suppeditat, quæstionem, quæ hactenus insolubilis videbatur, rerum vicissitudine divinitus ordinatâ sponte solutum iri, ita ut Procuratores Ecclesiarum, situ et administratione diversarum, consultandi invicem causâ, in unum cœtum coalescant.

Persuasum est nobis, ad unitatem in fide semel sanctis traditâ proximè accedere divini cultûs communionem, eamque societates Christianas firmissmo nexu copulare: et probè recordantes Librum Precum Communium, ab omnibus nostris Ecclesiis, aliquatenus variatum, retineri, et eximium unitatis vin-

culum extitisse, fratres nostros admonendos censemus, divini cultûs communionem immoderatis rituum diversitatibus in discrimen posse adduci. Intrinsecam Ecclesiarum variarum unitatem custodiendæ earum concordiæ adjumentum allaturam esse validissimum confidimus. Et dum liberè profitemur, amplam quandam rituum Ecclesiasticorum flexibilitatem esse exoptandam, quippe quæ latum quasi campum patefaciat legitimis piorum affectuum significationibus, nihilominus ad Apostolicum præceptum provocamus, "Omnia ad ædificationem fiant," et ad illam Ecclesiæ Catholicæ legem principalem, rectum ordinem commendantis atque obedientiam, etsi cum privatorum sensuum et propensionum abnegatione conjungantur, tanquam subsidia Christianæ Unitatis fundamentalia, imò etiam ad fidem ipsam efficaciter conservandam necessaria.

Nolumus huic argumento finem imponere, quin spem nostram seriò testificemur, omnes Ecclesiæ fideles agnituros fore, utcunque studiis in varia inclinantes, universos oportere subjici, conscientiæ ergo, in rebus ad ritus et cærimonias attinentibus, judiciis illis auctoritatem obtinentibus, quæ ab illâ Ecclesiâ particulari vel nationali promulgata sint, sub cujus tutelâ, Dei providentiâ, sint constituti; et sibi sedulò temperaturos ab omni qualicunque alienationis vel exacerbationis occasione; et quotidie Deum enixè obsecraturos, ut omnia Ecclesiæ membra a Spiritu Sancto dirigantur ad quæcunque recta sint excogitanda atque exequenda; et ut nos universi in illâ fraternâ dilectione, quæ pacis est ipsissimum vinculum et omnium virtutum, adunare dignetur.

* * * *

Gratias agimus Deo Omnipotenti maximas, eò quod

protestationes solennes a tot Ecclesiis et societatibus Christianis per orbem terrarum profectæ sint contra sedis Romanæ usurpationes, et contra novicia dogmata ejus auctoritate promulgata.

Affectuum benevolorum significatio debetur ab Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ universis, sive Ecclesiis, sive singulis, contra hos errores protestantibus, quippe qui difficultatibus forsitan laborent specialibus, quum propter Incredulitatis incursiones, tum vero propter Romanæ sedis arrogantiam.

Nos confitemur Unum tantum "Mediatorem Dei et hominum, Hominem Jesum Christum," "Qui est super omnia Deus in sæcula." Nos repudiamus, utpote Scripturis Sacris et Catholicæ veritati adversantem, qualemcunque doctrinam alios mediatores Ejus vice constituentem, vel aliquatenus detrahentem ab Illius Divinâ Majestate, et a plenitudine Deitatis in Illo inhabitantis, quæ immaculato illo Sacrificio, semel ab Eo in Cruce propter omnium hominum peccata oblato, infinitum pretium impertita est.

Commonendi igitur sunt a nobis fideles, facinus illud a Romano Episcopo patratum, in Concilio Vaticano, anno MDCCCLXX., quo sibi supereminentiam super omnes homines in rebus fidei et morum vindicavit, arrogatæ sibi Infallibilitatis prætextu, attributorum Ipsius Domini Nostri Jesu Christi manifestam fuisse invasionem.

Innotuerunt omnibus regulæ illæ fundamentales, juxta quas Ecclesia Anglicana seipsam reformavit. Nos Sanctas Scripturas sufficientem et supremam fidei regulam esse declaramus, et omnibus nostris diligenter scrutandas proponimus. Nos fidem nostram ipsis Symbolorum antiquorum vocibus profitemur. Nos Apostolicum ordinem Episcoporum, Presbyte-

rorum et Diaconorum retinemus. Ecclesiarum particularium sive nationalium libertates legitimas asserimus. Nos Librum Communium Precationum, necnon Administrationis Sacramentorum, populis nostris in manus damus, vernaculo eorum sermone compositum, et juxta optima et antiquissima fidei et divini cultûs exemplaria adornatum. Orbi universo patefacta sunt hæc nostra documenta; sciuntur et leguntur ab omnibus.

Libenter igitur amplectimur universos sese reformandi studiosos ad amussim Ecclesiæ primitivæ. Rigidam Uniformitatem non flagitamus; supervacaneas dissensiones deprecamur. Omnibus ad nos allectis, dum jugum erroris et superstitionis excutere moliuntur, commodare operam nostram parati sumus, et talia eis subministrare privilegia, qualia ipsis possint esse gratiosa, et nostris ipsorum institutis et formulis Ecclesiasticis consentanea.

* * * *

Sed hæc hâctenus. Quod ad quæstiones attinet nobis propositas quæ leges Matrimonii tangunt, dum ex animo agnoscimus angustias, ad quas nonnullæ nostræ Ecclesiæ a popularium suorum legum lationibus redactæ sunt, censemus quoque officium esse uniuscujusque Ecclesiæ operam dare, ut sanctitati Matrimonii custodiendæ consulatur, secundum mandata in Dei Verbo præscripta, et quemadmodum ab Ecclesiâ Christi hâctenus sunt recepta.

Rixas quasdam luctuosas de rituum Ecclesiasticorum quæstionibus, considerantes, quibus nonnullæ nostræ congregationes graviter perturbatæ sunt, nos affirmamus, nihil in diu usitatâ cærimoniarum consuetudine, contra Episcopi admonitionem, debere innovari.

Denique, nonnullas novitates, quum in agendo tum in docendo, quod ad Confessionem attinet, contemplantes, nos declaramus Anglicanæ Communionis Ecclesias firmiter eas leges tenere, quæ in hanc rem in Sacris Scripturis sunt promulgatæ, primitivæ Ecclesiæ professione sancitæ, et ab Anglicanâ Reformatione instauratæ. Et nos consultò censemus, nulli Ecclesiæ Ministro licere, ab iis, qui ad eum se recipiunt, doloris aperiendi gratiâ, omnium sigillatim peccatorum minutam enumerationem exquirere; vel privatam confessionem iis imperare, ante Sacrosanctæ Eucharistiæ participationem; vel præscribere, vel etiam commendare, confessionis consuetudinariæ coram sacerdote exercitationem; vel docere talem exercitationem, vel sacerdoti subjectionem, directionis, ut aiunt, causâ, conditiones esse necessarias, ad sublimissimam vitam spiritualem attingendam. Nihilominus non in animo habemus quoquam modo terminos imponere subsidiis, quæ in Libro nostro Precum Publicarum, ad conscientiarum sollicitarum sublevationem, providè subministrantur.

Hæ sunt determinationes quæstionum nobis propositarum, quatenus Ecclesiæ Universalis vel Ecclesiarum nostrarum conditionem attingere videbantur.

Ad hæc inspicienda varias Ecclesiarum Synodos, aliosque in eis Ecclesiis auctoritatem exercitantes, et universos denique Christi fideles, per orbem terrarum invitamus. Dominationem in cleris non affectamus; sed has determinationes, a cœtu nostro approbatas, rationi et conscientiæ fratrum nostrorum, utpote a Spiritu Sancto illuminatorum, commendamus, enixè Deum apprecantes, ut omnes ubique gentium Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Nomen invocantes, unâ mente

consocientur, in unâ Communione conjungantur,unam fidem semel sanctis traditam firmiter complectantur, et unum Suum Dominum in uno puritatis et dilectionis spiritu venerentur. Amen.

Subscripsi, in nomine Cœtûs Lambethani,

ARCHIBALDUS CAMPBELL,

Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis.

Archiepiscopi, Metropolitani, aliique Episcopi, qui Cœtui Lambethano adfuerunt.

The Archbishop of Canterbury.
The Archbishop of York.
The Archbishop of Armagh.
The Archbishop of Dublin.

The Bishop of London.
The Bishop of Winchester.
The Bishop of Llandaff.
The Bishop of Ripon.
The Bishop of Norwich.
The Bishop of Bangor.
The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
The Bishop of Chester.
The Bishop of St. Albans.
The Bishop of Hereford.
The Bishop of Peterborough.
The Bishop of Lincoln.
The Bishop of Salisbury.
The Bishop of Carlisle.
The Bishop of Exeter.
The Bishop of Bath and Wells.
The Bishop of Oxford.
The Bishop of Manchester.
The Bishop of Chichester.
The Bishop of St. Asaph.
The Bishop of Ely.
The Bishop of St. David's.
The Bishop of Truro.
The Bishop of Rochester.
The Bishop of Lichfield.
The Bishop of Sodor and Man.

The Bishop of Meath.
The Bishop of Down.
The Bishop of Killaloe.
The Bishop of Limerick.
The Bishop of Derry.
The Bishop of Cashel.
The Bishop of Ossory.

The Bishop of Moray. Primus.
The Bishop of St. Andrew's.
The Bishop of Edinburgh.
The Bishop of Aberdeen.
The Bishop of Glasgow.
The Bishop of Brechin.
The Bishop of Argyll.

The Bishop of Delaware.
The Bishop of New York.
The Bishop of Ohio.
The Bishop of Pennsylvania.
The Bishop of Western New York.
The Bishop of Nebraska.
The Bishop of Pittsburgh.

The Bishop of Louisiana.
The Bishop of Missouri.
The Bishop of Long Island.
The Bishop of Albany.
The Bishop of Central Pennsylvania.
The Assistant Bishop of North Carolina.
The Bishop of New Jersey.
The Bishop of Wisconsin.
The Bishop of Iowa.
The Bishop of Colorado.

The Bishop of Haiti.
The Bishop of Shanghai.

The Bishop of Montreal. Metropolitan.
The Bishop of Fredericton.
The Bishop of Nova Scotia.
The Bishop of Ontario.
The Bishop of Huron.
The Bishop of Toronto.
The Bishop of Niagara.

The Bishop of Madras.
The Bishop of Colombo.
The Bishop of Bombay.

The Bishop of Guiana.
The Bishop of Kingston.
The Bishop of Antigua.
The Bishop of Barbados.
The Bishop of Nassau.

The Bishop of Sydney. Metropolitan.
The Bishop of Adelaide.
The Bishop of North Queensland.

The Bishop of Christchurch. Metropolitan.
The Bishop of Dunedin.

The Bishop of Gibraltar.

The Bishop of Capetown. Metropolitan.
The Bishop of St. Helena.
The Bishop of Maritzburgh.
The Bishop of Bloemfontein.
The Bishop of Pretoria.

The Bishop of Rupertsland. Metropolitan.
The Bishop of British Columbia.
The Bishop of Saskatchewan.

The Bishop of the Falkland Islands.

The Bishop Suffragan of Dover.
The Bishop Suffragan of Guildford.
The Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham.
Bishop Perry.
Bishop McDougall.
Bishop Ryan.
Bishop Claughton.

OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Secretary of the Conference.
The Bishop of Edinburgh, Secretary of Committees.
Isambard Brunel, D.C.L., Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely, Assistant Secretary.

The following is the English ORIGINAL of those portions which are contained in the above Translations into Greek and Latin.[1]

[1] A good deal has been said and written lately "On the Study of Greek and Latin," especially at our Universities. I will not repeat what has already been urged in these pages, on the uses of Classical Literature, as an essential part of a Liberal Education, and particularly as indispensable for the study of Theology, and for Biblical Criticism, and for the defence of Revealed Religion (see above, p. 15—19). But there is another view of this subject which will, it may be supposed, commend itself even to those who discuss such a question as this on grounds of *practical utility*, and are disposed for such reasons to disparage the study of the ancient tongues in comparison with that of living languages, which are mediums of social communication. I will not dwell on the fact, that a person who has mastered the Greek and Latin languages can in fact understand French, Italian, and Spanish more perfectly than a Frenchman, Italian, or Spaniard who is not acquainted with those ancient languages, from which his own is in a great measure derived; and that, therefore, the study of Ancient languages is valuable for the thorough knowledge of Modern ones. But the truth also is, and it deserves attention at a time when the relations of England with the East are becoming more intimate (especially by the acquisition of Cyprus) that the Greek language, especially what is commonly called the Hellenistic form of it, is *not a dead language*, but a *living one*. Even the Greek newspapers (such as are printed at Constantinople and Athens) are receding farther from the Romaic, and approaching more nearly to the Hellenic. And the Hellenistic is the language of the Eastern Church. Let any one look at a work of such Greek Ecclesiastics as Œconomus, or Pharmakides, or Gregory of Chios, at the present time, or refer to the letter (printed above in vol. i. p. 293) from the Archbishop of Syros to the Author of these Volumes, and he will at once recognize the truth of this statement. When Pius IXth addressed the Greek Patriarchs in *Romaic*, and *not* in *Hellenic*, they imagined that he intended to insult them, and said that they might as well have addressed him in Italian, instead of Latin. The study of *ancient* Greek is therefore becoming more necessary from the conditions of *modern* Society, especially in religious and ecclesiastical matters. The Greek Church never uses the Romaic—but always the Hellenic—in her public Offices. And it is to be wished that the venerable *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* would print for circulation a cheap edition of the English Book of Common Prayer in *Hellenic* (such as Bagster's, Lond. 1820) instead of disseminating unscholarly versions of it in Romaic, which present our Prayer Book to the Greek mind—especially to the mind of Greek Bishops and Clergy—in an unfavourable and derogatory view. As to the Epistolary, and even Colloquial uses, of the Latin Language, and consequent advantages to be derived from it at the present time, some remarks have been offered in another place (above, vol. i. p. 462, 488).

To the faithful in Christ Jesus, greeting,—

We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred in number, all exercising superintendence over Dioceses, or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled, many of us from the most distant parts of the earth, at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1878, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Archibald Campbell, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England; after receiving, in the private Chapel of the said Palace, the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and after having united in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into our consideration various definite questions submitted to us affecting the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world.

We have made these questions the subject of serious deliberation for many days, and we now commend to the faithful the conclusions which have been adopted.

In considering the best mode of maintaining union among the various Churches of our Communion, the Committee, first of all, recognize, with deep thankfulness to Almighty God, the essential and evident unity in which the Church of England and the Churches in visible communion with her have always been bound together. United under One Divine Head in the fellowship of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the One Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, and maintained by the Primitive Church, receiving the same Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation—these Churches teach the same Word of God, partake of the same divinely-ordained Sacraments, through the ministry of the same Apostolic orders, and worship one God and Father through the same Lord Jesus Christ, by the same Holy and Divine Spirit, Who is given to those that believe, to guide them into all truth.

Together with this unity, however, there has existed among these Churches that variety of custom, discipline, and

form of worship which necessarily results from the exercise by each "particular or national Church" of its right "to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying." We gladly acknowledge that there is at present no real ground for anxiety on account of this diversity; but the desire has of late been largely felt and expressed, that some practical and efficient methods should be adopted, in order to guard against possible sources of disunion in the future, and at the same time further to manifest and cherish that true and substantial agreement which exists among these increasingly numerous Churches.

The method which first naturally suggests itself is that which, originating with the inspired Apostles, long served to hold all the Churches of Christ in one undivided and visible communion. The assembling, however, of a true General Council, such as the Church of England has always declared her readiness to resort to, is, in the present condition of Christendom, unhappily but obviously impossible. The difficulties attending the assembling of a Synod of all the Anglican Churches, though different in character and less serious in nature, seem to us nevertheless too great to allow of our recommending it for present adoption.

The experiment, now twice tried, of a Conference of Bishops called together by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and meeting under his presidency, offers at least the hope that the problem, hitherto unsolved, of combining together for consultation representatives of Churches so differently situated and administered, may find, in the providential course of events, its own solution. Your Committee would, on this point, venture to suggest that such Conferences, called together from time to time by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the request of, or in consultation with, the Bishops of our Communion, might with advantage be invested in future with somewhat larger liberty as to the initiation and selection of subjects for discussion. For example, a Committee might be constituted, such as should represent, more or less completely, the several Churches of the Anglican Communion; and to this Committee it might be entrusted

to draw up, after receiving communications from the Bishops, a scheme of subjects to be discussed.

Your Committee, believing that, next to oneness in "the Faith once delivered to the saints," communion in worship is the link which most firmly binds together bodies of Christian men, and remembering that the Book of Common Prayer, retained as it is, with some modifications, by all our Churches, has been one principal bond of union among them, desire to call attention to the fact that such communion in worship may be endangered by excessive diversities of ritual. They believe that the internal unity of the several Churches will help greatly to the union of these one with another. And, while they consider that such large elasticity in the forms of worship is desirable as will give wide scope to all legitimate expressions of devotional feeling, they would appeal, on the other hand, to the Apostolic precept that "all things be done unto edifying," and to the Catholic principle that order and obedience, even at the sacrifice of personal preferences and tastes, lie at the foundation of Christian unity, and are even essential to the successful maintenance of the Faith.

They cannot leave this subject without expressing an earnest hope that Churchmen of all views, however varying, will recognize the duty of submitting themselves, for conscience sake, in matters ritual and ceremonial, to the authoritative judgments of that particular or national Church in which, by God's Providence, they may be placed; and that they will abstain from all that tends to estrangement or irritation, and will rather daily and fervently pray that the Holy Spirit may guide every member of the Church to "think and do always such things as be rightful," and that He may unite us all in that brotherly charity which is "the very bond of peace and of all virtues."

The fact that a solemn protest is raised in so many Churches and Christian communities throughout the world against the usurpations of the See of Rome, and against the novel doctrines promulgated by its authority, is a subject for thankfulness to Almighty God. All sympathy is due from the Anglican Church to the Churches and individuals pro-

testing against these errors, and labouring, it may be, under special difficulties from the assaults of unbelief as well as from the pretensions of Rome.

We acknowledge but one Mediator between God and men —the Man Christ Jesus, Who is over all, God blessed for ever. We reject, as contrary to the Scriptures and to Catholic truth, any doctrine which would set up other mediators in His place, or which would take away from the Divine Majesty of the fulness of the Godhead which dwelleth in Him, and which gave an infinite value to the spotless Sacrifice which He offered, once for all, on the Cross for the sins of the whole world.

It is therefore our duty to warn the faithful that the act done by the Bishop of Rome, in the Vatican Council, in the year 1870—whereby he asserted a supremacy over all men in matters both of faith and morals, on the ground of an assumed infallibility—was an invasion of the attributes of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The principles on which the Church of England has reformed itself are well known. We proclaim the sufficiency and supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the ultimate rule of faith, and commend to our people the diligent study of the same. We confess our faith in the words of the ancient Catholic creeds. We retain the Apostolic order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. We assert the just liberties of particular or national Churches. We provide our people, in their own tongue, with a Book of Common Prayer and Offices for the administration of the Sacraments, in accordance with the best and most ancient types of Christian faith and worship. These documents are before the world, and can be known and read of all men. We gladly welcome every effort for reform upon the model of the Primitive Church. We do not demand a rigid uniformity; we deprecate needless divisions; but to those who are drawn to us in the endeavour to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition we are ready to offer all help, and such privileges as may be acceptable to them and are consistent with the maintenance of our own principles as enunciated in our formularies.

With regard to those questions in connexion with the Laws of Marriage, which have been submitted to them, your Committee, while fully recognizing the difficulties in which various branches of the Church have been placed by the action of local Legislatures, are of opinion that steps should be taken by each branch of the Church, according to its own discretion, to maintain the sanctity of marriage, agreeably to the principles set forth in the Word of God, as the Church of Christ hath hitherto received the same.

Considering unhappy disputes on questions of ritual, whereby divers congregations in the Church of England and elsewhere have been seriously disquieted, your Committee desire to affirm the principle that no alteration from long-accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the Bishop of the Diocese.

Further, having in view several novel practices and teachings on the subject of Confession, your Committee desire to affirm that in the matter of Confession the Churches of the Anglican Communion hold fast those principles which are set forth in the Holy Scriptures, which were professed by the Primitive Church, and which were reaffirmed at the English Reformation; and it is their deliberate opinion that no minister of the Church is authorized to require from those who may resort to him to open their grief a particular or detailed enumeration of all their sins, or to require private confession previous to receiving the Holy Communion, or to enjoin or even encourage the practice of habitual confession to a Priest, or to teach that such practice of habitual confession, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a Priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life. At the same time your Committee are not to be understood as desiring to limit in any way the provision made in the Book of Common Prayer for the relief of troubled consciences.

These are the practical conclusions at which we have arrived, which apply to all branches of the Church Universal. We invite to them the attention of the various Synods and other governing powers in the several Churches, and of all the faithful in Christ Jesus throughout the world.

We do not claim to be lords over God's heritage, but we commend the results of this our Conference to the reason and conscience of our brethren as enlightened by the Holy Spirit of God, praying that all throughout the world who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be of one mind, may be united in one fellowship, may hold fast the Faith once delivered to the saints, and worship their one Lord in the spirit of purity and love.

Signed, on behalf of the Conference,

A. C. Cantuar.

LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CYPRUS.

In the November after the Lambeth Conference, I was requested by the Rev. Josiah Spencer, to furnish him with a letter to the Archbishop of Cyprus. Mr. Spencer has now sailed to Cyprus (Jan. 1879), as Chaplain to the English residents there; in connexion with the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel."

The letter is as follows:—

Τῷ Πανιερωτάτῳ Κυπρίων Ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ σεβασμιωτάτοις Ἐπισκόποις, Χριστόφορος Λιγκολνίας ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ Ἐπίσκοπος, χαίρειν ἐν Κυρίῳ.

Συνίσταμεν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ Πανιερότητι τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν ἀγαπητὸν, τὸν αἰδέσιμον Ἰωσίαν Σπένσερ, Ἐκκλησίας Καθολικῆς Ἀγγλικανῆς πρεσβύτερον, ὀρθοδοξίᾳ πίστεως καὶ σεμνότητι βίου δεδοκιμασμένον, καὶ ἐκτενῶς ὑμῶν δεόμεθα ἵνα φιλοφρόνως αὐτὸν δέξησθε, καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῷ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρήζῃ πράγματι· καὶ γὰρ ἄξιός ἐστι.

Ἅμα καὶ μετάφρασιν, δι' ἡμετέρας μετριότητος πεπονημένην, σὺν αὐτῷ ἀπεστάλκαμεν Ἐπιστολῆς τῆς τῶν ἑκατὸν Ἐπισκόπων νεωστὶ ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ ἐν Παλατίῳ Λαμβηθανῷ συνηθροισμένων, εἰς ἣν ἐγκύπτοντες θεωρεῖν δύνησθε τί φρονεῖ ἡ Ἀγγλικανὴ Ἐκκλησία περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστεως, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν, καὶ περὶ τῶν Συμβόλων, τῶν ἐν ταῖς οἰκουμενικαῖς Συνόδοις τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἐκκλησίας κεκυρωμένων.

Λοιπὸν, μετὰ πολλοῦ σεβασμοῦ καὶ φιλοφροσύνης ὑμᾶς ἀσπαζόμεθα, ἀγαπητοὶ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀδελφοὶ, τῆς περιφήμου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου Ἀποστόλου Βαρνάβα πατρίδος ἀρχιερέας, καὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἐπιφανίου, τοῦ σοφωτάτου τῆς Σαλαμῖνος ἐν Κύπρῳ ἐπισκόπου, διαδόχους, καὶ ἐγκαρδίως τῷ Θεῷ

εὐχόμεθα, ἵνα, καθάπερ τανῦν συμπολῖται τῶν Κυπρίων *ἡμεῖς Ἄγγλοι, θείᾳ προνοίᾳ, γεγόναμεν, οὕτως μιᾷ γνώμῃ καὶ μιᾷ φωνῇ ἡμεῖς σὺν ὑμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι σεβώμεθα, καὶ ἵνα δῷ ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἵνα τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπουρανίου Πατρίδος σύνοικοι γενώμεθα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.* Ἀμήν.

Ἔρρωσθε ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἀδελφοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀγαπητοί.

Ἐδόθη ἐν Λιγκολνίᾳ, καὶ ἐπεσημάνθη τῇ ἐπισκοπικῇ ἡμῶν σφραγῖδι ἔτει σωτηρίῳ αωοή, μηνὸς Νοεμβρίου, ἡμέρᾳ κά.

Ὁ Λιγκολνίας Ἐπίσκοπος Χριστόφορος.

English Translation of the above.

To the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Cyprus and to the Right Reverend the Bishops his Suffragans, Christopher, Bishop of Lincoln, sends greeting in the Lord—

We commend to your Grace and Lordships, our beloved brother, the Rev. Josiah Spencer, Presbyter of the Anglican Catholic Church, well approved for the soundness of his faith and godliness of his life; and we earnestly pray you to receive him benevolently, and to assist him in whatever matter he may need your help; for he is worthy.

At the same time we have sent by his hands a copy of the translation, which has been made by us, of the letter of the Hundred Bishops lately gathered together in England in the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth; from the perusal of which you may perceive what the mind of the Church of England is concerning the faith that is in Christ, and concerning the Holy Scriptures, and concerning the Creeds, which were ratified in the Œcumenical Councils of the Ancient Church.

Finally, with much veneration and affection, dearly beloved in the Lord, we salute you the chief Pastors of the far-famed native land of the holy Apostle St. Barnabas; and the successors of the holy father St. Epiphanius, that most learned Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus; and heartily do we

pray to God, that like as now, by His Divine Providence, we who dwell in England have become fellow-citizens with you in Cyprus, so with one mind and one mouth we together with you may worship the same God and Father, through the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, in the same Holy Spirit, and that He may grant to us to be of one mind in all things; and that we may become fellow-citizens and dwellers together hereafter in the same heavenly City, for evermore. Amen.

Fare ye well, brethren dearly beloved in Christ.

Dated in the city of Lincoln, and sealed with our Episcopal seal, on the 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord 1878.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

A NEW EDITION OF

THE HOLY BIBLE,

With Introductions and Notes by

CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D.,

BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

THE OLD TESTAMENT,

In the Authorized Version, with Introduction, Notes, and Index.

In Parts.

PART	£	s.	d.
I. Genesis and Exodus	0	14	0
II. Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy	0	12	0
III. Joshua, Judges, Ruth	0	9	0
IV. Books of Samuel	0	7	0
V. Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther	0	15	0
VI. Book of Job	0	7	0
VII. Psalms	0	11	0
VIII. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon	0	9	0
IX. Isaiah	0	10	0
X. Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel	0	16	0
XI. Daniel	0	5	0
XII. Minor Prophets	0	9	0
Index	0	2	0
	£6	6	0

In Volumes.

VOL.	£	s.	d.
I. The Pentateuch	1	5	0
II. Joshua to Samuel	0	15	0
III. Kings to Esther	0	15	0
IV. Job to Song of Solomon	1	5	0
V. Isaiah to Ezekiel	1	5	0
VI. Daniel, Minor Prophets, and Index	0	15	0
	£6	0	0

THE GREEK TESTAMENT,

With Introductions, Notes, and Index.

In Parts.

PART	£	s.	d.
I. Gospels	0	16	0
II. Acts of the Apostles	0	8	0
III. St. Paul's Epistles	1	3	0
IV. General Epistles, Apocalypse, Index	0	16	0
	£3	3	0

In Volumes.

VOL.	£	s.	d.
I. Gospels and Acts of the Apostles	1	3	0
II. Epistles, Apocalypse, and Index	1	17	0
	£3	0	0

Any Part, or any Volume of the above, may be had separately.

Publications by Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln.

THE HOLY BIBLE; with Notes, Introductions, and Indexes. *New Edition.* Particulars may be seen in the previous Advertisement.

OCCASIONAL SERMONS preached in Westminster Abbey. Seven Volumes.

THE HOLY YEAR; or, Original Hymns for Sundays, Holy Days, and Daily Use. *Fifth Edition, large type, 1s.; smaller type, 6d.* With Tunes, *4s. 6d.*

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS; or, Manual of Instruction on the Church Universal, and on the Anglican Church. *Tenth Edition. 2s. 6d.*

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND. (1869.) *6s.*

S. HIPPOLYTUS AND THE CHURCH OF ROME, from the newly-discovered "Philosophumena." *8s. 6d.*

LETTERS TO M. GONDON on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome in Religion and Polity. *Third Edition. 7s. 6d.*

A SEQUEL TO THE ABOVE. *Second Edition. 6s. 6d.*

THEOCRITUS, Codicum MSS. ope recensitus et emendatus. 1877. *7s.*

CORRESPONDENCE OF RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D. 2 vols. *£2 2s.*

MEMOIRS OF WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. 2 vols. *£1 10s.*

GREECE, Historical, Pictorial, and Descriptive. *Fifth Edition. £1 8s.*

ATHENS AND ATTICA. *Second Edition. 8s. 6d.*

TOUR IN ITALY. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. *15s.*

THE MACCABEES AND THE CHURCH. *2s. 6d.*

BP. SANDERSON'S LECTURES on Conscience and Law. *3s. 6d.*

RIVINGTONS, 3, Waterloo Place, London; and at Oxford and Cambridge.